

← 1160

AN

INTRODUCTION

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

AN
INTRODUCTION
THE OLD TESTAMENT,

CRITICAL, HISTORICAL, AND THEOLOGICAL,

CONTAINING
A DISCUSSION OF THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTIONS BELONGING
TO THE SEVERAL BOOKS.

SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D.,
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE, AND LL.D.

VOL. II.



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN,
AND
20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.
1862.

CONTENTS.

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

	PAGE
I. Name.—II. Contents.—III. Unity and diversity.—IV. Sources.—V. Date and authorship.—VI. Nature of the history.—VII.—General scope.—VIII. The prophets in 1 Kings xxii. 6.—IX. Elisha's conduct to the children.....	1

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

I. Name.—II. Contents.—III. Sources.—IV. The books of Samuel and Kings among the Chronicler's sources.—V. Examination of 1 Chron. i.-ix.—VI. Relation of Chronicles to the other historical books of the Old Testament.—VII. Scope.—VIII. Apologetic spirit and historical credibility.—IX. State of the text.—X. Date and author.—XI. Elijah's letter, in 2 Chron. xxi. 12-15 ...	47
--	----

THE BOOK OF EZRA.

I. Union of Ezra and Nehemiah.—II. Contents.—III. The number of sacred vessels stated to have been taken from the temple by Nebuchadnezzar.—IV. Lists of the numbers of returned exiles.—V. Authorship.—VI. Alleged unity and independence	121
--	-----

THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH.

I. Contents.—II. Comparison of Nehemiah xi. 3-24, with 1 Chron. ix. 1-22.—III. Examination of Nehemiah x. 2-28.—IV. Time of Nehemiah's administration.—V. Authorship and date.—VI. Summary of authorship in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.—VII. The so-called seventy years' captivity in Babylon...	133
---	-----

CONTENTS.

THE BOOK OF ESTHER.

	PAGE
I. Contents.—II. Scope.—III. The Ahasuerus of the book.—IV. Historical improbabilities.—V. Integrity.—VI. Author and age.—VII. Absence of a religious spirit.—VIII. Estimates of the book by Jews and Christians	151

THE POETICAL BOOKS.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

I. Name of the hero described in the book.—II. Contents.—III. Structure of the poem.—IV. Locality of Job and his three friends.—V. Age of Job.—VI. His historical existence.—VII. Locality and age of the writer.—VIII. Unity and integrity.—IX. Problem of the book.—X. Job xix. 25-27.—XI. Job xiv. 13-15.—XII. Job xvi. 18, 19.—XIII. Job xxii. 15-20.—XIV. Views of Satan and angels.—XV. Internal evidence of the book opposed to plenary inspiration.	174
---	-----

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

I. General title.—II. Divisions.—III. Alphabetical psalms.—IV. Titles.—V. Genuineness of the titles.—VI. Authors.—VII. Alleged Maccabean psalms.—VIII. Collection, and distribution into five books.—IX. Usage of the names Jehovah and Elohim.—X. Duplicates.—XI. Poetical characteristics.—XII. Messianic psalms.—XIII. Doctrine of the psalms respecting a future state.—XIV. Ethics of the book.—XV. How sacrifice is spoken of.—XVI. The poetry often turned into prose.—XVII. Devotional character.—XVIII. The hundred and fifty-first psalm.—XIX. Quotations in the New Testament	234
--	-----

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

I. Name.—II. Division and contents.—III. Titles and characteristics.—IV. Authorship. V. State of the text.—VI. Nature and characteristics of proverbs generally, and of the Hebrew proverbs in particular.—VII. Wisdom as a person.—VIII. Canonical authority	318
---	-----

THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES.

I. Contents.—II. Meaning of Coheleth.—III. Authorship and age.—IV. Doubts entertained of its authority and inspiration.—V. Views of Coheleth respecting immortality and future judgment.—VI. Scope.—VII. Modes of dividing the contents.—VIII. Unity.—IX. Sceptical, epicurean, and fatalist tendencies in the book.....	352
--	-----

THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

I. Title.—II. Contents.—III. Speakers.—IV. Character of the speeches.—V. Modes of interpretation.—VI. Authorship and age.—VII. Time and place.—VIII. Form of the work.—IX. Unity	389
--	-----

PROPHECY.

PAGE

I. Prophets generally.—II. Prophecy generally.—III. Hebrew prophecy.—	
IV. Psychological method and development of Hebrew prophecy.—V. The religious nature and significance of Hebrew prophecy, with its essential difference from the prophets and oracles of heathenism.—VI. Relation of prophecy to the Mosaic constitution and law.—VII. Call to the prophetic ministry.—VIII. Signs and wonders employed by the prophets.—IX. Historical development of Hebrew prophecy in its relation to the priesthood.—X. Prophecy and politics.—XI. Schools of the prophets.—XII. Principles constituting the groundwork of the prophetic ministry.—XIII. Prophecy and prediction.—XIV. Every single prophecy not always fulfilled.—XV. Messianic prophecies.—XVI. Diction and style of prophecy.—XVII. Historic periods of prophecy.—XVIII. Completion of Hebrew prophecy in Christianity	422

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

THE BOOKS OF KINGS.

I. NAME.—The name of this work is obviously taken from the contents, which contain a history of the theocracy under the kings from Solomon till the downfall of Judah, when the people were carried away into captivity. Though now divided into two books, the work was originally one. It was separated in the Septuagint version, where it is numbered as *the third and fourth of the kingdoms*. From the Greek translation, the division passed into the Latin version; and Daniel Bomberg first applied it to the Hebrew Bible, so that ordinary editions of the latter exhibit it now. The proper Hebrew title of the undivided work **ספר מלכים** *book of Kings*, should not have been touched or modified. The following is a summary of the contents.

II. CONTENTS.—In the first chapter we have an account of the old age of David, and of the measures taken by Adonijah, his fourth and eldest surviving son, in concert with Joab and Abiathar the priest, to secure his succession to the throne. This son made a sacrifice-feast at the rock of Zohelath, in the vicinity of Jerusalem, to which he invited all his brethren and all the courtiers except Solomon, Nathan, Benaiah, and others attached to the young prince (i. 1-10). By the advice of Nathan, Bathsheba went to the king, and, reminding him of a promise he had made to her with an oath that Solomon should be his successor, informed him that Adonijah had already laid claim to the throne; and that she, with her son, should be in danger as soon as the king died. According to arrangement, Nathan came in and seconded her request, addressing David as if he had authorised what Adonijah was doing at the feast, and gently blaming him for not telling his faithful counsellor. Then Bathsheba was called, to whom the monarch renewed his oath, and gave direction for the immediate inauguration of the young prince at Gihon (11-40). When Adonijah and his guests heard of this transaction, they were afraid and dispersed. Adonijah himself

took refuge in the tabernacle; but being reassured by a message from Solomon, he presented himself before the young king, did homage to him, and was dismissed (41-53).

The second chapter commences with an account of David's last words to Solomon, and his death after a reign of forty years. This dying charge related to the young king's faithful observance of the divine laws; to Joab, whose "hoar head he was not to let go down to the grave in peace;" to the sons of Barzillai, the Gileadite; to Shimei, whom he was to hold guilty for his insulting conduct, and to bring down his hoary head to the grave with blood (1-11). After this Adonijah made interest with Bathsheba to ask for him, from her son, Abishag the maid, who had cherished the old king in marriage. The petition was presented in due form, but was refused; and being construed as an indication of a fresh design on the throne, the king ordered him to be put to death. In pursuance of the same vindictive measures recommended by David before his death, Abiathar was deprived of the priesthood, and banished to Anathoth. His life was spared because he had borne the ark before David, and sympathised in David's afflictions. On hearing of this, Joab took refuge in the sanctuary; but that did not save him, for Benaiah was ordered to go thither and slay him, which he did accordingly. Benaiah was put in the post of Joab; and Zadok in that of Abiathar. Shimei was sent for by the king to Jerusalem, ordered to build an house there, and never to leave the place on the peril of his life. But at the end of three years he went to Gath in pursuit of two slaves. When he had returned with them to Jerusalem the king sent for him, reminded him of what he had done to David, and ordered him to be slain (12-46).

The third chapter describes Solomon's marriage to the daughter of the king of Egypt; and how he and the people sacrificed in high places, which was contrary to the law. The chief high place was Gibeon, where God appeared to him in a dream, and promised to give him not only wisdom in answer to his petition, but also riches and honour. Returning to Jerusalem, he offered sacrifice before the ark of the covenant, and made a feast to all his servants (1-15). Immediately after, he gave a proof of his wisdom in determining the real mother of a child; so that his fame was spread abroad (16-28).

The fourth chapter commences with a list of his principal officers in different departments (1-6). This is followed by another, in which it is said that he had twelve officers over all Israel to furnish supplies for the royal household, each a month in the year. Their names and districts are also specified (7-19). We have next a description of the peace, prosperity, and extent

of his kingdom; of the daily provision of his household, his stables and horses (20-28). So far different sources were used in this chapter; which will account for the irregular order of its contents, as well as the differences between analogous particulars. Solomon's great wisdom and knowledge are next described (29-34). After Hiram had sent to congratulate him, the latter made known his purpose to build a temple for the national worship, and requested a supply of timber from Lebanon. The application was favourably entertained. Tyrian workmen were to cut down and convey cedar and timber, which was to be delivered at some convenient port; in return for which supplies of corn and oil were to be furnished to Hiram yearly (v. 1-12). Solomon himself raised a levy of 30,000 men, whom he sent to Lebanon; 10,000 a month in rotation. Besides these, who seem to have been free Israelites, he had 70,000 that bore burdens, and 80,000 hewers of stone; the whole being directed by 3,300 overseers (13-18).

The sixth chapter commences with a description of the building of the temple, which was begun 480 years after the exodus from Egypt. The model of the structure was the tabernacle constructed by Moses. The extreme length, exclusive of the base, which projected on all sides $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet, and the entrance steps was about 150 feet; the extreme breadth 78 feet; and the greatest height, including the breastwork, 51 feet. As the projecting base was 9 feet high, the extreme height was 60 feet. The porch or hall before the temple proper was 30 feet in length (breadth), corresponding to the breadth of the house, and 15 feet in breadth (length). Its height was the same as that of the main edifice, viz., 45 feet. After giving these dimensions of the chief parts of the building, the writer states how light and air were admitted (vi. 1-4). Against the outer walls were three stories of chambers, the lowest chamber $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet broad, the second 9, and the third $10\frac{1}{2}$; the projections leaving space for rests for the timbers of the inner apartments. From the second chamber the third was reached by winding stairs within. Their external height was 27 feet, leaving room above for the windows. The stones of the edifice were prepared before being brought; so that there was no sound heard of hammer, axe, or tool. The holy of holies was a square, each side 35 feet. The holy place was a parallelogram, 60 feet long and 30 broad. The floor was laid with planks of fir. The walls were cased with cedar, and the beams were of the same wood, all highly carved and ornamented. Most of the walls too, as well as the furniture, were overlaid with gold. Doors of olive wood and fir separated the holy from the most holy place. The whole was finished in the space of seven and a half years (5-38).

The seventh chapter relates to the building of Solomon's palace, which occupied thirteen years. This edifice was, in one view of it, broader and longer than the temple; the length being 150 feet, the breadth 75, and the height 45. It consisted of three stories, on four rows of cedar pillars, with cedar beams on the pillars. The foundations and walls of the palace were of hewn stones of large size; and the whole was surrounded with a colonnade, consisting of three rows of stone pillars, and one of cedar beams (vii. 1-12). Hiram, a skilful worker in brass from Tyre, came to superintend additional portions of the temple building. For the porch of the temple were made two brazen pillars, 27 feet high, including the shafts and capitals (13-22). The brazen sea was also made, *i.e.*, a large circular vessel, $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet high with its pedestal, and 15 in diameter. It stood upon 12 sculptured oxen, 3 fronting each quarter of the compass; and held 2,000 baths, or 15,000 gallons. In addition to this large laver, 10 brazen stands or bases were made, on which were set 10 lavers, each holding 40 baths or 300 gallons. The bases were adorned with sculptured lions, oxen, cherubim, and palm trees, and each was on four brazen wheels. These bases with their lavers stood five in a row on the two sides of the temple; while the brazen sea was on the south side towards the east. Smaller brazen vessels are specified as having been made by Hiram. This is followed by a recapitulation of all he had fabricated, and a concluding remark upon the place they were cast in (23-47). Other articles belonging to the temple were made of gold; and it is stated that Solomon brought all the silver and gold bequeathed by his father and not used, depositing it among the treasures of the sacred house (48-51).

The eighth chapter describes the dedication of the temple. Solomon assembled all the leading men of the tribes at Jerusalem; in whose presence the priests carried the ark of the covenant into the holy of holies. Nothing was in it but the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb. When the priests had left the holy place, the cloud filled the house, so that they could not stand to minister because of the cloud (viii. 1-11). After Solomon had said that he built a settled habitation for Jehovah to dwell in, in the thick darkness, he turned about to the congregation and spoke while they stood, first congratulating the people on the completion of such a work (14-21), then offering up a dedication-prayer (22-53), and lastly, pronouncing a closing benediction, wish, and admonition (54-61). The solemnities were concluded with a sacrifice of peace-offerings, and a great feast lasting double the usual time of a tabernacle feast, *viz.*, fourteen days (62-66).

After this great work was completed, the Lord appeared again

to Solomon in a dream, assuring him that his prayer had been accepted, and that the temple had been hallowed with the divine presence. He promised to prosper him and establish his throne for ever, as long as he would keep his statutes; but if he or his children should turn aside after other gods, Israel should be cut off from the land, and the house desecrated (ix. 1-9). Various notices supplementing the account of Solomon's buildings are subjoined. In acknowledgment of the services rendered by Hiram, Solomon had given him twenty cities in Galilee, with which he was dissatisfied, though he gave the king of Palestine, one hundred and twenty talents of gold. When the latter was building both at Jerusalem and elsewhere, the remaining Canaanites were his bond servants, but the Israelites were honourable servants (10-23). Solomon transferred his Egyptian spouse from the city of David to the house built for her. He made a navy of ships in Ezion-gaber at the head of the Red Sea, which, with Hiram's skilful seamen, sailed to Ophir, and brought thence 420 talents of gold. It is said that he offered sacrifices three times a year in the temple he had built, *i.e.*, at the three great festivals, as we learn from Chronicles. The clause "and he burnt incense upon the altar that was before the Lord," intimating that besides sacrificing on the altar of burnt offering, he presented incense on *the altar of incense*, contains some mistake (24-28).

The fame of Solomon being spread abroad, the queen of Sheba in Arabia-Felix came with a great train and very costly presents to Jerusalem. Her expectations were more than realised by all that she witnessed of the wisdom and magnificence of the monarch; and she departed blessing the Lord his God who had established him on the throne of Israel. It is said that she gave him 120 talents of gold, with a great store of spices and precious stones (x. 1-10). The navy of Hiram not only brought gold from Ophir, but almug trees and precious stones. Of the former material Solomon caused pillars for his palace and the temple to be made, as well as harps and psalteries for musicians. His annual receipt, arising from direct taxes paid by the Israelites, was 666 talents of gold—a sum incredibly large for the population of the country, besides what he received from imports on merchandise and tributary princes. He made 200 targets of beaten gold of 200 shekels each, and 300 smaller shields, each consisting of three pounds of the same metal, for his body-guard. His throne was of ivory overlaid with gold. The throne had six steps. Two sculptured lions stood one on each side of it, and two on each of the steps. All the drinking vessels of his house were of pure gold. Once in three years came the Tarshish navy from Ophir or India, bringing gold and

silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks. Every visitor brought his present. Horses, chariots, and linen-yarn were brought from Egypt (11-29).

The eleventh chapter states that Solomon was captivated by many foreign women, so that he had 700 wives, princesses, and 300 concubines, who in his old age turned away his heart after other gods, to whom he sacrificed and burnt incense. For such apostasy the Lord threatened him, saying that He should rend the kingdom from him and give it to another. But for David's sake the punishment was suspended till the days of his son, with whom only one tribe was to remain (xi. 1-13). Adversaries now disturbed him, Hadad, Rezon, and Jeroboam. A short account of Hadad's history is given. Rezon was a Syrian who became captain of a band, and assumed the sovereignty of Damascus. Jeroboam, of the tribe of Ephraim, had been appointed over the Ephraimites during the buildings at Jerusalem. Ahijah the prophet being clothed with a new garment met Jeroboam outside Jerusalem, and tore his new garment in twelve pieces, announcing to him that ten tribes should be given to him after Solomon's death, on account of the idolatries of the king and people. The king coming to the knowledge of the design of Jeroboam, sought to kill him; but he fled into Egypt and remained there till Solomon's death. After reigning forty years, Solomon died, and was succeeded by his son Rehoboam (14-43).

The twelfth chapter relates to the revolt of the ten tribes from Rehoboam. The people, or at least a number of them, sent for Jeroboam from Egypt, and when he came to Shechem where Rehoboam was to be crowned, he asked on their behalf some relief from the heavy burden imposed. But Rehoboam followed the advice of his young companions, and refused to redress any of the public grievances; in consequence of which ten tribes revolted, killed Adoram who collected the tribute, and made Jeroboam their king. Rehoboam raised a large army for the purpose of crushing the insurrection, but was prevented from proceeding farther by Shemaiah the prophet (1-24). The residence of Jeroboam was at Shechem, and also Penuel which he rebuilt; the latter beyond the Jordan south-east of the mouth of the Jabbok. Afraid of the allegiance of his subjects should they go to sacrifice at Jerusalem, he provided for an independent worship by setting up two golden calves in Bethel and Dan; and made priests of the lowest of the people who were not of the Levites (25-34). As Jeroboam was ministering at his altar in Bethel, a prophet came out of Judah and proclaimed that upon the altar, Josiah, a descendant of David, should at a future time offer its priests and burn their bones; attesting his commission by declaring that the altar should immediately be broken and

the ashes on it scattered. The uplifted hand of the angry king ordering him to be seized was immediately withered, but restored at the intercession of the prophet. The prophet refused the king's hospitality and present, and returned by a different way from that by which he had come (xiii. 1-10). An old prophet at Bethel hearing from his sons of what had happened, hastened after the stranger and persuaded him to return with him for refreshment, under the false representation of receiving directions from an angel to that effect. While they were at table a divine message came to the host, who informed the other that because he had disobeyed the Lord's command he should not be buried in the sepulchre of his fathers. In accordance with this a lion met him by the way and slew him. The old prophet went to the place where his body was lying in the way, with the ass and the lion both standing by, brought it back and buried it in his own sepulchre, declaring to his children that the prophecy uttered by the man of God against Jeroboam should surely come to pass. But the king obstinately persisted in his idolatrous conduct (11-33). When Abijah, Jeroboam's son, was sick, the king of Israel sent his wife disguised to the prophet Abijah at Shiloh, with presents. The latter, forewarned by God, recognised her, and sent back a message to her husband, to the effect that his evil courses should be signally punished; that his male posterity should die dishonourably, and the child at present ill should expire at the very moment the mother returned. He alone of all Jeroboam's seed should come to the grave. All this happened as foretold. After a reign of twenty-two years the first king of Israel died, and was succeeded by his son Nadab (xiv. 1-20).

The narrative now passes to Rehoboam, who according to the text began to reign when he was forty-one years of age, and reigned seventeen years. The people of his kingdom during his administration were defiled with idolatry and gross immorality. In his fifth year, Shishak king of Egypt came and plundered Jerusalem, carrying away the treasures of the temple and palace. He was succeeded by his son Abijam (21-31), whose conduct resembled his father's, since he followed the same idolatrous practices. He and Jeroboam were constantly at war (xv. 1-8). His son Asa succeeded him and reigned forty-one years, who did what was right, removing all the idols and Sodomites out of the land, and even deposing from her rank the queen mother, because she had set up an abominable idol in a grove (9-15). There was war between Asa and Baasha king of Israel all their days. The latter built Ramah in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, in order to stop the communication between the two kingdoms. In opposition to him Asa

made an alliance with Benhadad king of Syria, to whom he sent a message to Damascus with rich presents belonging to the temple and palace. The Syrian therefore attacked the northern parts of Israel, compelling Baasha to abandon Ramah. Asa pulled it down, and built of the materials Geba and Mizpah. After his death, Jehoshaphat his son became king (16-24). The history now reverts to the kings of Israel contemporary with Asa, speaking first of Nadab son of Jeroboam, who after a wicked reign of two years, was cut off by Baasha, who reigned in his stead. Baasha proceeded to extirpate every branch of the royal house, because of Jeroboam's sins, as the prophet had announced; and walked in the ways of his predecessors. Jehu prophesied against him, announcing that his posterity should be wholly cut off. After reigning twenty-four years he was succeeded by his son Elah, who reigned no more than two years because Zimri killed him at a banquet. As soon as the latter began to reign, he slew all the family of his predecessor, according to the prophecy of Jehu. But when the Israelite army which was besieging Gibbethon heard of Zimri's usurpation, they made Omri their king, marched against Tirzah, laid siege to it, and took it. Zimri, despairing of holding out any longer in the citadel, set fire to the royal palace and perished in the flames. The army were divided into two parties, some following Tibni, others Omri. The former being slain, the latter continued to reign ten years. It was he that bought the hill Samaria, and built a city on it, where he established the capital of the northern kingdom. His character was like that of his predecessors. He was succeeded by Ahab his son, who did more evil than his predecessors; for he married Jezebel a Sidonian, worshipped Baal, and built a temple in Samaria for the idol-god. He made an image of Astarte also (xv. 25-xvi. 34).

The seventeenth chapter introduces to the reader Elijah the Tishbite, of the inhabitants of Gilead, who must have been previously exercising his prophetic ministry. He said to Ahab that there should neither be dew nor rain but as he himself should order it. The prophet was then directed to hide by the brook Cherith on the east of Jordan, where the ravens were commanded to bring him flesh. By reason of the long drought the brook dried up, he could stay there no longer, and was divinely ordered to repair to Zarephath, a city between Tyre and Sidon, where a widow woman would sustain him. When he approached the city gate the widow was gathering sticks; and he begged of her a drink of water and a morsel of bread. She replied that she had no more than a handful of meal and a little oil, and that she was gathering the sticks to dress these for a last meal for herself and only son, before they should die of

hunger. The prophet ordered her to prepare him a cake first, and then to make more for herself and son, assuring her that her little stock should last as long as the drought. All this came to pass (xvii. 1-16). The son of his hostess sickened and died. She charged Elijah with being the cause of his death. But he restored him alive to his mother (17-24). In the third year of the famine, Elijah was divinely instructed to return to Israel and present himself before Ahab. On his way he met Obadiah, steward of the royal house, who, when Jezebel sought to destroy all the prophets, took a hundred and hid them in two caves, where he fed them with bread and water; and was now sent to look for water for the horses and mules. Elijah bade him tell the king of his presence. But Obadiah was afraid that should he depart on such an errand, Elijah would go away somewhere, so that the monarch not finding him would slay the messenger. The prophet however assured him of his intention to see the king; and when the two met, Ahab accused him of causing the drought, while Elijah imputed it to the sins of the monarch in following Baalim, and challenged the king to put to a public proof the rightful sovereignty of Jehovah or Baal. The prophets of Baal, 450 in number, and the prophets of Astarte 400 in number, were accordingly gathered together at mount Carmel. All the people were present. Elijah proposed that the idolatrous priests should give two bullocks, choosing one for themselves, cutting it in pieces and laying it on wood with no fire under; while he should dress the other and dispose of it in the same manner. The god answering by fire should be recognized as the national god. In vain did they call upon their god from morning till noon. Elijah mocked them with derisive language, and they became greatly enraged, cutting themselves with knives and lancets, as was their custom. Till the time of evening sacrifice they continued their efforts to extort the required sign. Elijah next invited all the people to approach that they might the better see and hear what was to take place; then he repaired an altar that had been broken down, with twelve stones according to the number of the tribes; made a trench about it, adjusted the wood, cut up the bullock, and laid it on the wood, poured much water upon it which ran and filled the trench, waited for the hour of evening sacrifice, and prayed to God. The answer was immediately given by a fire which consumed all, and dried up even the water. The people prostrated themselves to the earth and acknowledged Jehovah to be God. Elijah cried out that the prophets should not escape; and they were immediately taken to the brook Kishon and slain. Turning to the king he bade him eat and drink forthwith, because abundance of rain

was coming. He himself went up to the top of Carmel, cast himself down upon the earth, and sent his servant seven times to look at the western sky. At the seventh time he was informed that a little cloud rose up out of the sea. Ahab was therefore urged to depart lest the floods should detain him. But a great storm arose amid which the king rode to Jezreel; the prophet running before him all the way (xviii. 1-46). When Jezebel heard of what had been done to her prophets, she sent a threatening message to Elijah, which led him to flee to Beersheba, where he left his servant and went a day's journey into the wilderness of Paran. Here, seated under a juniper-tree, he prayed that he might die. But an angel touched him in sleep, bidding him arise and eat. When he looked there was a cake baked on the coals, and a cruse of water at his head, of which he partook and laid him down again. Aroused a second time in the same manner and for the same purpose, he travelled in the strength of the food forty days and forty nights to Horeb, where he lodged in a cave. There the word of the Lord came to him and inquired his business. He answered that he was the only survivor of all the prophets, and that his life was sought after by the idolaters of Israel. Being ordered to stand upon the mount, he witnessed a furious storm, an earthquake, and a fire; but Jehovah was not in them. After them a still, small voice was heard, before which he veiled his face, and God asked him his business there; to which question he gave the same answer as before. He was ordered to go to the wilderness of Damascus to anoint Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha. Whoever should escape the sword of Hazael was to fall by that of Jehu; and he that escaped from Jehu, was to be slain by Elisha. Seven thousand true worshippers were still left in the land. Departing from Horeb, he met with Elisha plowing. Eleven oxen with ploughs were before him, and his was the twelfth; so that he was a considerable land-owner and could follow Elijah with difficulty. The latter cast his prophetic mantle upon him and passed by. Elisha asked permission to bid his parents farewell, which was granted; but at the same time he was reminded of the high significance of the symbolical transaction which had just taken place. He took the pair of oxen he had been ploughing with, offered them for a thank-offering, feasted his friends on the flesh, and went with Elijah (xix. 1-21).

Benhadad not content with the promise of Ahab to give up to him his silver, gold, wives and children, wished to search the palaces both of himself and his officers for the purpose of emptying them of their valuable contents. Both elders and citizens advised Ahab to refuse; and a prophet assured him of victory by a very small and feeble band. Benhadad was

therefore attacked at noon, the Syrian army was utterly defeated, and the king himself escaped on horseback (xx. 1-21). Ahab was told that the king of Syria would come against him early the following year. Accordingly the Syrians, with an army as large as before, commanded by captains instead of the kings who were subject to him, went up to Aphek in Jezreel, determined to hazard the fortune of war in the plains, not in a hilly country to which the late defeat was attributed. A prophet again promised Ahab the victory, and accordingly 100,000 footmen were slain by the Israelites. The rest fled into the city, where a wall fell and overwhelmed 27,000. A suppliant message was sent from the place where Benhadad was shut up, requesting that his life might be spared. This Ahab readily complied with, and a friendly covenant was concluded between the monarchs (22-34). By means of a parabolic transaction a prophet causes Ahab to condemn himself for sparing Benhadad, and denounces the divine judgment against him. He returns in a melancholy mood to Samaria (35-43).

The twenty-first chapter records a gross act of injustice committed by Ahab at the instigation of his wife. Naboth had a vineyard close to the royal palace at Jezreel, which the king wished to buy for a garden but the owner refused to sell. Seeing her husband sad, Jezebel on learning the cause undertook to get possession of the vineyard. She wrote letters in the king's name and with his seal to the chief men of Naboth's city, ordering them to proclaim a fast and suborn false witnesses against Naboth, accusing him of blasphemy and treason. All this was done, and he was stoned to death. Ahab immediately took possession of the coveted property (1-16). Elijah, commissioned by God, came to denounce the divine judgments against him and Jezebel. The wicked king terrified by such warnings humbled himself and put on the usual habit of deep mourning, on which the prophet deferred the threatened misfortunes till the time of his son (17-29). In the third year of peace between Syria and Israel, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, on a visit to Ahab was induced by the latter to join him in an attempt to recover Ramoth-gilead unjustly retained by Benhadad. At the suggestion of Jehoshaphat, the king of Israel gathered the prophets, 400 in number, together, to ask them respecting the propriety of going up against Ramoth-gilead. All promised success. Distrustful because of their complete unanimity, Jehoshaphat asked if there was not another prophet, and was informed of Micaiah, son of Imlah, whom Ahab disliked because he always prophesied evil. Accordingly he was sent for; and in the meantime Zedekiah, one of the prophets,

made horns of iron to symbolise the defeat of the Syrians, while all the prophets encouraged Ahab to go to battle. When Micaiah was brought before the king, he at first repeated the encouragement given by the other prophets; but Ahab perceiving that he was not in earnest, adjured him to speak nothing but truth. Accordingly he said he had seen in a vision all Israel scattered over the hills like sheep without a shepherd, and the Lord said, They have no master, let them return to their homes. He added further, that he had seen Jehovah sitting on His throne, and all the host of heaven standing by Him; and when He asked who should persuade Ahab to go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead, a spirit came forth and undertook to do it by becoming a lying spirit in the mouth of all the prophets. Zedekiah smote Micaiah on the cheek, inquiring which way the lying spirit had gone from him to prompt his and his associates' reprover; to whom Micaiah answered that he should know in the day of his hiding for fear of the enemy. Ahab ordered the prophet who had thus announced evil to be put in close confinement and fed on bread and water. The war was commenced, the king of Israel having gone in disguise, while Jehoshaphat put on his royal robes. The captains of the chariots of the enemy, mistaking the latter for Ahab, attacked him; but he cried for help to his followers and was saved. The king of Israel having been mortally wounded by the chance shot of an archer, ordered his charioteer to drive him from the field: he died in the evening, and was buried at Samaria. When his bloody chariot was washed in the pool close by Samaria, the dogs licked his blood, fulfilling Elijah's prophecy, according to the writer (xxii. 1-38). The thirty-ninth and fortieth verses are a continuation of xvi. 34, after which the history proceeds to narrate Jehoshaphat's actions. He walked in the steps of his father, and did what was right in the sight of the Lord (41-45). Verses 46-50 are an appendix, in which it is said there was no proper king in Edom, but a deputy appointed by Jehoshaphat. Jehoshaphat projected an expedition of ships to go to Ophir, but it was rendered fruitless by a storm. Ahaziah proposed a new expedition, with some of his subjects to accompany it who were acquainted with the sea; but Jehoshaphat declined the alliance. Ahaziah was son of Ahab, whose reign lasted but two years. Like his parents, he was addicted to idolatrous practices, and wrought evil in the sight of the Lord (51-53). At this place the first book terminates, improperly separating the connected section xxii. 51-2 Kings i. 18.

After the death of Ahab, the Moabites rebelled against Israel. Ahaziah, having fallen down through a window in his palace, was sick, and sent messengers to consult the oracle of Baal at

Ekron whether he should recover. Elijah was divinely commanded to set out from Carmel and meet them. He reproved them for not consulting the God of Israel, and declared that the king should die. When the messengers returned and reported that they had encountered a traveller who sent them back with the announcement that the wound was mortal, he asked them respecting his appearance, and discovered that it was Elijah (2 Kings i. 1-8). The king despatched a party of fifty men to apprehend him as he sat on the top of a hill; but he commanded fire from heaven and destroyed them. A second party of fifty shared the same fate. The captain of the third fifty, fearing the death of his predecessors, fell on his knees before the prophet and begged his life. By direction of the angel of Jehovah, Elijah went with him to the royal presence, and repeated what he had before announced to the messengers. So Ahaziah died, and was succeeded by his brother Jehoram (9-18).

The second chapter contains the close of Elijah's earthly life. Departing from Gilgal, not the Gilgal lying between Jericho and Jordan, but the Gilgal spoken of in Judg. iii. 9 (four miles from Shilo, and rather more from Bethel, now *Jiljiliah*), he told Elisha to remain behind, for the Lord had sent him to Bethel; but he would not leave his master. At Bethel, the sons of the prophets told Elisha that God was about to take away Elijah, to whom he replied that he knew it. The faithful servant refused again to leave his master, and both went together to Jericho, where the sons of the prophets addressed Elisha as their brethren at Bethel had done, and received the same answer. Refusing a third time to remain behind, Elisha went with Elijah to the Jordan, where fifty of the sons of the prophets went to see afar off how the two would cross the river. Elijah smote the waters with his mantle and they separated, allowing himself and attendant to go over on dry land. Elisha being permitted to make a parting request, asked for a double portion of Elijah's spirit, and was told it should be granted provided he should be counted worthy of seeing him caught away. As they were talking, a chariot of horses and fire divided them; Elijah was taken up to heaven in a whirlwind, while Elisha, as soon as he saw it, cried out, "my father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof," meaning that he was Elisha's spiritual father and the guardian of Israel. In token of his great grief Elisha tore his garments in two, took up Elijah's mantle which had fallen from him, and with it smote and parted the Jordan as before. The sons of the prophets met him at Jericho, and acknowledged him as Elijah's successor. The inhabitants of the city requested permission to send out fifty men to search for his master, but he refused. In consequence

however of their urgency, he gave way, and they sought three days, but did not find him (ii. 1-18).

The inhabitants of Jericho represented to Elisha that the water of the place was unwholesome, and therefore barrenness prevailed. He took a new cruse, put salt in it, and poured it into the fountain which supplied the city, assuring them that the water should be wholesome and productiveness follow. It came to pass as he said (19-22). As he went up along the street to Bethel, boys came out and mocked him on account of his bald head. He turned back and cursed them in the name of the Lord. Two she bears came out of the wood and tare forty-two of them. Going thence to mount Carmel, he returned to Samaria (23-25).

Jehoram's reign is now resumed. Mesha king of Moab rebelled, and refused to pay his yearly tribute of flocks. The three kings, Jehoram, Jehoshaphat of Judah, and the king of Edom marched together against the revolters, but suffered greatly for want of water in the wilderness. On Jehoshaphat asking if there was not a prophet through whom they might inquire of the Lord, one of Jehoram's servants answered that Elisha was in the army. So the three kings went down to him from their tents on a height. With Jehoram he would have no intercourse, but referred him to Baal's prophets. For Jehoshaphat he had some regard. He called for a minstrel; and when the music began, the spirit of prophecy seized him. He then ordered ditches to be made in the valley, and declared that they should be filled with water without either wind or rain. He also predicted that the Moabites should be entirely defeated. The next morning the country was filled with water; and the Moabites hearing of the expedition approached. But the colour of the water on which the morning sun shone attracted their notice. They pronounced it blood, thought that the kings had slain one another, and came to the enemy's camp to plunder it, where they were smitten, and fled. The allied army destroyed their cities as far as Hareseth their chief fortress. The king of Moab seeing his cause desperate, resolved to break through the besieging army with 700 men, but was unable. At last, to appease the anger of his offended god, he took his eldest son and offered him for a burnt-offering on the wall. This horrible deed excited great indignation in the Israelite army; and the land where such abominations could be perpetrated was abandoned (iii. 1-27).

The widow of one of the sons of the prophets applied to Elisha against a creditor who had come to take her two sons for slaves. The prophet being informed that she had nothing in the house except a pot of oil, told her to borrow from her neighbours as

many empty vessels as she could, and fill them from the cask. She did so, shut herself up with her sons, and filled with oil as many vessels as she had. The man of God bade her sell the oil, pay her debt, and support herself and sons with the rest (iv. 1-7). It happened that he was frequently the guest of a woman of distinction at Shunem, who, with her husband's consent, had fitted up and furnished a small chamber for his use. Grateful for such hospitality, he asked her what recompence he could make for it; whether she wished him to speak on her behalf to the king or his general. But she replied that she had nothing to ask of such high persons, as she belonged to the people. Being informed however by his servant Gehazi that she had no son, he called her and promised her a son within a year, which happened as he said. The child being grown went out one day to the reapers, where his father was busy, and complained of sudden illness in the head. Being carried home to his mother, he died. She laid him on the bed where Elisha usually reposed, and hasted on a saddled ass to seek the prophet at mount Carmel. Gehazi was sent to meet her, as soon as the prophet heard of her coming, and to inquire what was the matter. She threw herself at his feet, and spoke in a way to upbraid Elisha, as if he had deceived her in the promise of a son. Then Gehazi was ordered to take his master's staff, hasten to the woman's house and lay it on the face of the child. The experiment did not succeed, apparently from want of faith in the servant, and therefore he went to meet Elisha who was coming along with the mother. The prophet shut himself up in the apartment with the body, stretched himself on it till it became warm, rose up, returned, and repeated the same action till the child opened his eyes. Then he called the mother and bade her take her restored son (8-37).

The prophet, coming again to Gilgal, found that there was a famine in the district. As the sons of the prophets were sitting at his feet in the attitude of learners, he bade his servant prepare pottage for them. One of the disciples of the prophets went out to the field to gather materials for the mess, and among them collected some poisonous fruits. As they ate, they cried out that there was poison in the pot; and therefore Elisha took meal and put it in, which proved an antidote (38-41). A man came from the neighbourhood with a present of twenty loaves of barley meal and some ears of ripe corn, which he ordered to be set before them; and it supplied all the hundred, with a portion left (42-44).

Naaman, commander of the Syrian army, was leprous. At the instance of a captive Israelite maid application was made to Elisha for a cure. The king of Syria wrote to the king of

Israel, the messenger who bore the letter having a very rich present for the latter. The king of Israel, who was probably Jehoram, looked upon the request in the letter to cure Naaman as the indication of a disposition to seek a quarrel. When Elisha heard of the king's distress, he sent a message to the effect that Naaman should come to him. Accordingly the Syrian general came to Elisha's door, and received there a message that he should wash in Jordan seven times and be clean. But Naaman was angry at his reception and the apparent slight thrown upon the rivers of his own land. Being persuaded, however, by his servants to try the simple remedy, he did so and was healed. Returning to Elisha full of gratitude, he urged him to take a reward, which was firmly declined. With two mules' burden of earth which he asked that he might sacrifice on it to Jehovah, he departed, having prayed that his fault might be forgiven if he should sometimes have to go into the temple of Rimmon with his master. But Gehazi thought that he might have something of the presents his master had refused, and followed Naaman who lighted from his chariot to meet him. Having falsely said that Elisha had been visited by two sons of the prophets, and had sent him for something, such as a talent of silver and two changes of raiment, the Syrian gave him more than he asked, and sent two of his servants to carry it. Gehazi took the things from them before they came within sight of Elisha's house, concealed them, and went to his master, who charged him with the fraud and inflicted the leprosy on him and his posterity for ever (v. 1-27),

The sons of the prophets proposed to Elisha to remove from Gilgal near the Jordan and build more commodious dwellings there. He accompanied them therefore to the banks of the river to cut the timber. A borrowed axe-head fell into the water, and Elisha threw in a stick which drew the iron to the surface (vi. 1-7). Again did the king of Syria war against Israel; but the king of Israel was repeatedly saved by intelligence he got from Elisha respecting the locality of the enemy. Having learned that the prophet had revealed his plans to the king of Israel, and that he was at Dothan, in the plain of Jezreel, he sent a great army by night to take him. The prophet's servant beheld the host in the morning, and told his master in great fear. But Elisha prayed that the veil might be taken from the servant's eyes; and accordingly he saw that the mountain on which the city was built was full of fiery horses and chariots round about Elisha. The prophet prayed again, and the Syrians were smitten with blindness. He then told them they had lost their way, and proposed to conduct them to the person they sought. He led them to Samaria, where, in

answer to the prayer of the prophet, their eyes were opened and they saw where they were. The king of Israel was forbidden to smite them; for the prophet ordered that they should be feasted and sent back (vi. 1-23). After this Benhadad laid siege to Samaria, and the inhabitants of the city were sorely pressed by famine. A woman applied to the king for redress, telling him that she had agreed with another to kill each her son on two successive days, and feed on the flesh; but that after she had fulfilled her part of the agreement the other had hid her son. Horrified at this recital, the king rent his clothes and put on sackcloth. He threatened to kill Elisha because of the advice given. The prophet was sitting in his house surrounded by elders, whom he told of the king's messenger and his errand and ordered to shut fast the door against him. The king, who had followed his messenger, is represented as saying, "Behold, this evil is of the Lord: what should I wait for the Lord any longer?" (24-33.) In the king's presence the prophet declared that provisions should be very cheap in Samaria on the morrow. A nobleman beside the king ventured to express his doubt of such a thing, even if the Lord would make windows in heaven. Elisha told him that he should see, but not eat of the plenty. Four lepers at the gate resolved to go to the Syrians and surrender themselves, which they did at the twilight, but found no person there; for the Lord had made the Syrian host hear a noise of chariots and of horses, and, thinking that the king of the Hittites as well as of the Egyptians had been hired against them, had fled, leaving their tents with all their horses and asses. The lepers, after providing bountifully for themselves, went back with the tidings to the city; but the king thought it a stratagem of the enemy. He was advised to send horsemen to see, who, following the Syrians as far as Jordan, found the way covered with garments and vessels cast away in haste. As these horsemen returned to tell the king, the people went out and spoiled the Syrian tents; so that the abundance verified the prophet's words. The courtier who thought the prediction of the prophet incredible, having been appointed to the oversight of the gate, was trodden to death by the throng; and thus the prophetic word respecting him was also fulfilled (vii. 1-20).

The woman of Shunom, whose son Elisha restored to life, having been advised to remove on account of an approaching famine of seven years' duration, sojourned in the land of the Philistines during the period foretold; after which she returned and begged of the king to be reinstated in her property. Gehazi was just telling the king of the prophet's miracles, and of the very miracle of raising her son to life, when the woman herself appeared to present her suit, and was pointed out as the person.

The king restored her land and the revenue of it for the past seven years (viii. 1-6). The prophet came to Damascus when Benhadad was sick, who, hearing of his arrival, sent Hazael with a rich present, to ask about his recovery. Elisha told him to go and say to his master that he would certainly recover, though the Lord had revealed to his mind that he should surely die. Moved to tears as the man of God was, he was asked the cause of such emotion by Hazael; to whom he answered that he could not but think mournfully of the cruelties which Hazael as king of Israel was about to perpetrate. The messenger professed great astonishment at the idea of purposing to be king, returned to his master, and repeated the prophet's words. The next day he dipped a thick cloth in water and spread it out on the sick man's face, causing his death by suffocation (7-15).

Jehoram king of Judah, having married the daughter of Ahab, did evil in the sight of Jehovah and walked in the ways of the kings of Israel. In his reign Edom revolted from Judah. He made an unsuccessful attempt to reduce it. After reigning eight years he was succeeded by his son Ahaziah who reigned but one year and followed the steps of his father. He went to fight against Hazael, king of Syria, in Ramoth-gilead along with Joram, Ahab's son, and visited the latter in Jezreel, after he had been wounded by the Syrians (16-29).

Elisha sent a young prophet with a box of ointment to Ramoth in Gilead, ordering him to seek out Jehu, and when he had found him to take him to an inner chamber and there anoint him king over Israel; after which he was to hasten back with all speed. The young man found him sitting with the captains of the host, did as he was told, and said that Jehu was appointed to smite the race of Ahab in revenge for the blood of the prophets shed by Jezebel. Having come to an understanding with his companions, they proclaimed him king by the sound of trumpet. The first care of the new king was to kill Joram who lay ill in Jezreel. A watchman on the tower there saw the party of Jehu approaching. A horseman being sent to meet them and ask their purpose was ordered behind. A second met with the same reception. As soon as the king understood it was Jehu, he and Ahaziah, king of Judah, took their chariots and met him. But Joram soon perceived the hostile intent of Jehu and fled, saying to Ahaziah that there was treachery. An arrow from Jehu's bow pierced his heart and he sank down. His body was thrown into the portion of the field of Naboth. Ahaziah fled also and was pursued by Jehu, who wounded him in his chariot, but he escaped to Megiddo and died there. His servant conveyed his body to Jerusalem for burial. Jezebel, hearing that Jehu had come to Jezreel, adorned herself, looked

out a window of the palace, and as Jehu entered the gate asked of him in defiant tone, "Is there to be peace, thou Zimri, murderer of his master?" He bade two or three eunuchs throw her down; she was killed with the fall, and her blood sprinkled the wall and the horses. After feasting, he commanded that her body should be taken and buried. But the messengers found only a few parts of the mangled corpse; which when Jehu heard, he remarked that it was the fulfilment of the divine word spoken by Elijah the prophet (ix. 1-37).

Jehu next wrote a letter from Jezreel to the elders of Samaria and such as had brought up Ahab's children, to the effect that as they were strong they should choose the fittest of their wards, put him on the throne, and fight for the family. But they professed allegiance to himself, for they were afraid. A second time he wrote, bidding them behead Ahab's sons and come the next day to Jezreel. This was done, and their heads were sent to him in baskets. Jehu then addressed the people, avowing his conspiracy against his master, but denying the murder of the children, and excusing his proceedings by the prophecy of Elijah. He then slew all that remained of Ahab's family, together with his principal men and servants. As he went to Samaria he met the brethren of Ahaziah, who said that they were on their way to salute the sons of Joram. But he ordered them all to be slain to the number of forty-two (x. 1-14). Proceeding on his journey he met Jehonadab, whom he took up in his chariot, inviting him to see his zeal for the Lord; and at Samaria all were slain that remained to Ahab (15-17). Professing his great attachment to Baal, he summoned all his prophets and servants that he might offer a great sacrifice to the god. Accordingly the devotees assembled to a man in his temple, and received appropriate vestments. After care had been taken that none of the worshippers of Jehovah was with them, Jehu posted eighty men outside, ordering them to slay every one. This command was strictly fulfilled. The destroying party burned all the images of Baal, brake down the temple, and turned it into an offensive use. Notwithstanding all this zeal in the extermination of idolatry, it is said that Jehu did not depart from the sins of Jeroboam. Yet because he had destroyed the house of Ahab, the Lord promised that his children to the fourth generation should sit on the throne. In his reign Hazael smote Israel, and took possession of the territory of Gad, Reuben, and Manasseh, east of the Jordan. After reigning twenty-eight years Jehu died, and was succeeded by his son Jehoahaz (18-36).

The eleventh chapter relates how Athaliah, Ahaziah's mother, destroyed all the seed royal and usurped the throne. Joash, however, was hid in the precincts of the temple for six years. In the

seventh year Jehoiada took measures in concert with the captains of the army to place the young king on the throne. He was therefore brought forth and anointed, amid the applause of the people. When Athaliah became aware of what had been done she cried, "Treason! treason!" but was put to death. The narrative then records how Jehoiada repaired the evils that had been done during Athaliah's usurpation, and restored the worship of God, after breaking the temple, altars, and images of Baal (xi. 1-21).

The new king Jehoash, who was seven years old when he began to reign, acted virtuously, because he followed the counsels of Jehoiada. For the repair of the temple he agreed with the priests that all the assessed and spontaneous offerings of the people should be applied to that purpose. But in the twenty-third year of his reign, the priests had not repaired the breaches of the temple according to contract, and therefore the king ordered that a chest should be made and set beside the altar for the oblations to be dropped into. When it was full, the king's scribe and the high priest had it counted and given to the persons who were repairing the house. The priests themselves received the trespass and sin-money (xii. 1-16). Then Hazael, having taken Gath, marched towards Jerusalem. But Jehoash bought him off with a rich present of consecrated things and treasures belonging to the temple and palace. He was slain by two of his servants conspiring against him, and was succeeded by his son Amaziah (17-21).

The reign of Jehoahaz king of Israel was a wicked one, because he followed the course of Jeroboam. In consequence of the sins of the king and people God delivered them into the hands of the Syrians, who left to Jehoahaz but fifty horsemen, ten chariots, and 10,000 footmen; so terribly had his forces been reduced. In the midst of this oppression the king betook himself to prayer, which was not in vain; for a deliverer was sent in Jeroboam, Jehoahaz's second successor. After reigning seventeen years he was succeeded by his son Jehoash, who reigned sixteen years, and acted wickedly like his father. His war with Amaziah of Judah, his death and burial are noticed (xiii. 1-13). This is succeeded by an account of an interview which Jehoash had with Elisha the prophet during the last illness of the latter. As the king bent over the sick man and lamented the fallen forces of Israel, he was ordered by the prophet to shoot an arrow out of the window eastward; and after he did so, was told that it foreshadowed the total defeat of the Syrians in Aphek. Again, Elisha bade him strike with a bundle of arrows towards the ground, on which he smote thrice, at which Elisha was angry; for had he

smitten five or six times Syria would have been consumed, whereas only three battles should be gained. After the prophet's death bands of Moabites invaded the land; and as they were burying a man they spied a band, and therefore hastily cast the body into the sepulchre of Elisha, where it became reanimated as soon as it touched the bones (14-21).

The preceding section or extract from Elisha's history should have been inserted before Jehoash's death. After the death of Hazael, who had oppressed Israel all the days of Jehoahaz, Ben-hadad his son reigned over Syria. Jehoash was successful in three encounters with him, recovering the cities taken from his father (22-25). In the tenth verse the thirty-seventh year of Joash should be the thirty-ninth or fortieth, as is obvious from a comparison with the first verse.

Amaziah son of Joash king of Judah came to the throne when he was twenty-five years of age, and reigned twenty-nine years. He acted like his father, rightly on the whole, yet tolerating practices that were illegal. He slew those that had murdered his father, but not their children. In the valley of Salt south of the Dead Sea he slew 10,000 Edomites; took Petra their capital, and gave it another name. Flushed with his successes he sent a defiance to Jehoash king of Israel, who returned an appropriate reply. Both kings at the head of their armies met at Bethshemesh, where Judah was defeated, Amaziah himself taken prisoner, and a great breach made in the walls of Jerusalem, through which the victor and his host entered in triumph. Having plundered the temple and palace of their treasures, and taken hostages, Jehoash returned to Samaria, where he died and was succeeded by his son Jeroboam (xiv. 1-16). Amaziah survived him fifteen years. A conspiracy having been formed against him in Jerusalem he fled to Lachish; but was pursued and slain. His son Azariah was made king at sixteen years of age. He built Elath and restored it to Judah. Jeroboam the second king of Israel walked in the ways of Jeroboam son of Nebat. He restored the borders of Israel from Epiphania on the Orontes to the Dead Sea, according to the prophetic word of Jonah, and was succeeded by his son Zachariah (17-29). The twenty-third verse states that he reigned forty-one years; it should be fifty-one.

Azariah king of Judah followed the example of his father Amaziah in doing what was right before the Lord. He began to reign in the fifteenth year of Jeroboam (not the twenty-seventh). God smote him with leprosy, so that he dwelt apart outside Jerusalem, while his son Jotham managed the affairs of the kingdom and succeeded him (xv. 1-7). Zachariah the son of Jeroboam had ascended the throne of Israel, who did evil in

the sight of the Lord. He reigned only six months, having been openly slain by Shallum, who conspired against him and reigned in his stead. The latter reigned a month, and was slain in Samaria by Menahem, general of Zachariah's army at Tirzah. This Menahem committed great cruelties against the inhabitants of Tiphseh because they resisted his usurpation. In his reign of ten years he followed the ways of Jeroboam. Under him Pul king of Assyria overran the land, but was induced to withdraw for the bribe of 1000 talents of silver exacted from the wealthy men—at the rate of 50 silver shekels each. Pekahiah Menahem's son reigned two years, following in the evil steps of his father. He was murdered by Pekah, who reigned twenty years, and acted like Jeroboam. In his days Tiglath-pileser came and took many places, carrying away numbers into captivity. Hoshea conspired against him, slew him, and reigned in his stead. Jotham king of Judah reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem, doing what was right in the sight of the Lord. In his latter days the Syrians and Israelites invaded the kingdom (xv. 8-38).

Ahaz the son of Jotham was twenty years old when he began to reign in Judah, and reigned sixteen years. According to this statement Ahaz begat Hezekiah when he was ten years of age, which is exceedingly improbable. If he was twenty-five when he began to reign, he begat Hezekiah in his sixteenth year. The latter is perhaps the right reading. This king walked in the worst ways of his predecessors, offering up in the fire even his son as a sacrifice to Moloch, and burning incense to idols. At that time Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Israel came up together to besiege Jerusalem, but were unsuccessful in the attempt. Rezin however took Elath on the Red Sea, which he restored to the Edomites, who retained possession of it. In his extremity Ahaz called in the aid of Tiglath-pileser, hiring him with the gold and silver treasures of the temple and palace. Accordingly the Assyrian king attacked Damascus and took it, carried away many of its inhabitants, and slew Rezin. Ahaz visited him at Damascus, and seeing an altar there sent a pattern of it to Urijah the priest, who had one made like it and put in place of the brazen altar, which he removed for the purpose. On his return the king sacrificed on it, and commanded that it should be used henceforward for the daily sacrifices; while the brazen altar he himself should employ for the purpose of inquiring the will of God. He also broke off some of the costly materials of the temple, and gave them to the king of Assyria. His son Hezekiah succeeded him.

In the twelfth year of Ahaz (it should rather be the fourteenth) Hoshea began to reign over Israel; who, though he did what was evil in the sight of the Lord, was not so wicked as

the kings of Israel before him. Being subdued by Shalmaneser he became tributary to that monarch. But when he conspired against the king of Assyria, entered into correspondence with So of Egypt, and ceased to pay his annual tribute, he was taken and imprisoned by Shalmaneser. The Assyrians then spread themselves over the whole land, went up to Samaria, and besieged it three years. Having conquered the whole kingdom in the ninth year of Hoshea, Shalmaneser carried the inhabitants away as captives into Assyria, and located them in different parts (xvii. 1-6). The compiler now gives his own reflections on the causes of the catastrophe, which he finds in apostasy from the worship of Jehovah, notwithstanding the warnings given by the prophets (7-23). Such was the termination of the kingdom of Israel after it had existed about 241 years.

Shalmaneser peopled the country which he had divested of its inhabitants with new settlers from the province of Babylon, and from Mesopotamia who did not fear the Lord; and therefore it was supposed that He sent lions among them. When the king of Assyria was informed of the circumstance, he ordered a Jewish priest to instruct them in the nature of the local faith. The priest came, dwelt in Bethel, and taught them. It appears, however, that the various tribes and inhabitants of cities made gods of their own; the lowest of the people became priests of the high places; and idolatry was commonly practised, though they worshipped the true God also (24-33). The compiler proceeds to describe the religious condition of the mixed race, *i.e.* the Samaritans, whose origin he had just given. They had not reformed their mongrel worship, but acted as their fathers had done, fearing Jehovah and serving graven images (34-41). Hezekiah, son of Ahaz, began to reign over Judah in the third of Hoshea, when he was twenty-five years old. He was a religious king, who removed idolatrous altars, and destroyed the brazen serpent long ago erected by Moses. The Lord was therefore with him, and prospered him in his undertakings. He rebelled against the king of Assyria, and smote the Philistines. After repeating what had been already narrated respecting the catastrophe of the northern kingdom, the writer relates that Sennacherib invaded and took all the fenced cities of Judah in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. The king of Judah purchased peace with a large sum, some of it taken from the temple which he stripped of its gold, and some from the palace. The Assyrian monarch did not return to his own country, but sent a great host against Jerusalem under the leadership of persons named. Before the walls the chief men of the Assyrians were met by the supreme officers of Hezekiah. Here Rabshakeh used insulting and opprobrious language, and

being requested to speak in the Aramaean tongue, turned to the people within hearing on the wall, and addressed them in their own Hebrew language, recommending them to make peace with the king of Assyria till he should come and transport them to a fertile country; and bidding them not to trust in Hezekiah nor in their God, who could not deliver them from the hand of their masters any more than the gods of Hamath, Arpad, Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah had delivered Samaria. The messengers, according to Hezekiah's injunction, made no answer to Rabshakeh, but returned with great grief and told him the defiant words (xviii. 1-37).

In his distress Hezekiah repaired to the temple, and sent for Isaiah the prophet to pray for the inhabitants of the city still left. The prophet sent back an encouraging message to the effect that the king should dismiss his fears; for that the Lord would send such a spirit into Sennacherib as would take him back to his own land, where he should be slain. Rabshakeh returning to his master found him besieging Libna. When Sennacherib heard of Tirhakah king of Ethiopia coming against him, he sent a blasphemous letter to Hezekiah, which the latter took to the temple and spread before the Lord, praying for deliverance from the enemy. Then Isaiah sent to Hezekiah assuring him that his prayer had been heard, and that Jehovah would protect his people, causing their proud invader to return by the way he came. On that night the angel of the Lord went forth and smote 185,000 Assyrians, so that in the morning the survivors found only dead bodies. Sennacherib returning to Nineveh was assassinated by his sons as he worshipped in the temple of his idol-god, and was succeeded by Esarhaddon (xix. 1-37).

About that time Hezekiah, having been attacked with disease, was told by the prophet Isaiah to prepare for death. But the king prayed earnestly and wept sore, on which Isaiah as he left the palace was ordered to return and announce his restoration to health, so that he should be able to go up to the temple within three days. It was also a divine message by the prophet that fifteen years should be added to his life, that he should be delivered from Assyria, and the city be protected. By Isaiah's direction a lump of figs applied to the monarch's boil proved the means of his recovery. Having asked of the prophet a sign to the effect that he should be healed within three days, it was proposed that the sun's shadow should either go forwards or backwards ten degrees. The king chose the latter. Then Isaiah prayed to the Lord, who brought the shadow ten degrees backward (xx. 1-10).

Some time after, Berodach-baladan hearing that Hezekiah had

been sick sent letters and a present to him, ostensibly to congratulate him on his recovery, but really to ascertain the condition of Judah. On this occasion the king made an imprudent display of all his treasures to the messengers. Isaiah hearing of the thing predicted that a time should come when all his treasures should be carried away to Babylon, and his posterity be prisoners and slaves there. The king expressed contentment with the divine decree, inasmuch as the threatening was not to be executed in his own day (12-21).

Manasseh his son succeeded Hezekiah on the throne, at the age of twelve. Instead of following his father's steps he acted with great folly, rebuilding the idolatrous places and altars which had been destroyed, and worshipping all the host of heaven. He even built idolatrous altars in the courts of the temple, offered his son in the fire a sacrifice to Moloch, used enchantments, and had dealings with wizards. A graven image of the Asherah (Astarte) he had made was also set in the temple. In consequence of such wickedness, the Lord announced by his prophets the approaching ruin of the nation. After a reign of fifty-five years Manasseh died and was succeeded by his son Amon, who reigned but two years, and followed in the steps of his father. He was assassinated by his servants, who in their turn were slain by the people. Amon's son was then set upon the throne (xxi. 1-26).

Josiah was but eight years of age when he began to reign. His government continued thirty-one years, during which he effected great reforms in the kingdom, both religious and civil. In the eighteenth year of his reign, Shaphan the scribe, having been sent by the king to the high priest with a message respecting the payment of the workmen employed in repairing the temple out of the people's voluntary offerings, returned with the intelligence that the high priest had found the book of the law in the temple, and read the volume before Josiah. The king was in great distress when he heard the contents, on account of guilt contracted against the Lord for neglecting its words. The principal courtiers were sent to Huldah a prophetess, to inquire the will of Jehovah. She predicted that all the threatenings contained in the book would be fulfilled and the people fully punished for their sins, but that the king himself should be spared the sight of such evil in his own days, because he had penitently humbled himself (xxii. 1-20).

In the 23rd chapter we are informed how Josiah summoned together all the elders of the people, read before them and other principal men, the book that had been found, and covenanted on behalf of himself and the people to observe all the precepts of the law. He next proceeded to root out idolatry

and all illegal worship of Jehovah. The vessels used in idolatrous services he caused to be carried out of Jerusalem and burned. The priests were deposed. The image of Astarte set up by Manasseh in the temple was also burnt to powder. He demolished the dwellings of the Sodomites beside the temples, and defiled the high places in the cities of Judah where priests had burnt incense. In like manner he desecrated Topheth in the valley of Hinnom. Other objects and places of idolatry were treated in the same fashion (xxiii. 1-14). Proceeding in this work of purification to the northern kingdom, he destroyed the altar and high place at Bethel, slew the priests of the idolatrous localities in the cities of Samaria, and defiled the places by burning dead men's bones upon the altars (15-20). After this he proclaimed a solemn passover, which was kept at Jerusalem in the eighteenth year of his reign (21-23). Having completed his reform of public worship and kept the passover, he turned his attention to wizards and the like, as well as to all domestic idolatry and superstition. Yet though there was no king like him among his predecessors, the Lord did not turn from his anger against Judah, but declared that Judah and Jerusalem should be cast off (24-28).

In Josiah's time Pharaoh-nechoh attacked the king of Assyria, Nabopolassar, at the Euphrates, and Josiah marched against him. The pious king, however, was killed in a battle fought at Megiddo. His body was brought to Jerusalem for burial. The people made his son Jehoahaz king in his stead. But he reigned only three months, for Pharaoh-nechoh pronounced his deposition at Riblah, put the country under heavy tribute, and raised his brother Eliakim, changing his name to Jehoiakim, to the throne. Jehoahaz died a captive in Egypt. The new king set up by Pharaoh-nechoh was obliged to tax the people heavily to satisfy the demands of his master; and after an evil reign of eleven years in Jerusalem, was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin. It is also related, that in his days (in the fifth of his reign) Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopolassar threatened Jerusalem; and therefore Jehoiakim submitted, and became his tributary for three years, at the end of which he rebelled against his master (xxiii. 29-xxiv. 7). Jehoiachin reigned but three months, for Nebuchadnezzar sent an army against Jerusalem, which he himself followed. The Jewish king went out with his mother and principal courtiers, and surrendered. The Babylonians plundered the temple and palace, carried captive Jehoiachin and his court, with all the principal inhabitants and mechanics of the land, leaving none but the poorest behind. Mattaniah, the king's uncle, was put upon the vacant throne by the victor, his name being changed to Zedekiah. He reigned

eleven years, and acted like Jehoiakim (xxiv. 8-20). In the ninth year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar came again with all his host against Jerusalem, and laid siege to it. This expedition was the consequence of Zedekiah's revolt against the Babylonian monarch. The siege continued till the eleventh year of Zedekiah, when the city was reduced by famine. Part of the besieged and the king attempting to escape by night, were overtaken by the enemy in the plains of Jericho, where his followers were scattered and he himself taken prisoner. When he was brought to Riblah where Nebuchadnezzar's head-quarters were, Zedekiah's sons were put to death before their father, his own eyes put out, and himself carried prisoner to Babylon. A month later, Nebuzar-adan, captain of the guard, went to Jerusalem and plundered the whole city, burning the temple, palace, and all the principal houses. The walls were also broken down. The remnant of the city he transported to Babylon, leaving the poor to be vinedressers and husbandmen. All the valuable vessels in the temple were also taken away, and many precious articles broken, that the metal of them might be more easily carried off. The chief priest, the second priest, the three keepers of the door, with a number of other principal men found in the city, were brought to the king of Babylon at Riblah and put to death (xxv. 1-21). Gedaliah was set over the remnant not carried away. But after seven months he was slain by a small body of conspirators; and then the entire population fled to Egypt, fearing the anger of the Babylonians. Such was the termination of the kingdom of Judah, after it had existed about 387 years (22-26).

In the 37th year of Jehoiachin's captivity, Evil-merodach, Nebuchadnezzar's successor, took his prisoner out of his durance, treated him with respect, and made him a perpetual guest at the royal table (27-30).

III. UNITY AND DIVERSITY.—The unity of the work is apparent from a certain uniformity of description and language pervading it. Accordingly it proceeded in its present form from one hand. Thus there is throughout a careful observance of chronology in relation to persons as well as to important events, as in 1 Kings ii. 11; vi. 1, 37, 38; vii. 1; viii. 2, 65, 66; ix. 10; xi. 42; xiv. 20, 21, 25; xv. 1, 2, 9, 10, 25, 33; xvi. 8, 10, 15, 23, 29; xxii. 1, 2, 41, 42, 51; 2 Kings i. 17; iii. 1; viii. 16, 25, 26; ix. 29; x. 36; xi. 3, 4; xii. 1, 2, 6; xiii. 1, 10; xiv. 1, 2, 17, 23; xv. 1, 2, 8, 13, 17; xvi. 1, 2; xvii. 1, 5; xviii. 1, 2, 9, 10, 13; xxi. 1, 19; xxii. 1; xxiii. 23, 31, 36; xxiv. 1, 8, 12, 18; xxv. 1, 2, 3, 8, 25, 27.

In the same way the actions of the kings are looked at according to the standard of the law, 1 Kings ii. 3; iii. 14; vi. 12;

viii. 58, 61; ix. 4, 6; xi. 33, 38; 2 Kings x. 31; xiv. 6; xvii. 13, 15, 34, 37; xviii. 6; xxi. 8; xxii. 13; xxiii. 3, 21, 25.

The references to sacrificing in high places are frequent and similar, as in 1 Kings iii. 2; xv. 14; xxii. 44; 2 Kings xii. 3; xiv. 4; xv. 4, 35; xviii. 4.

The death and burial of the kings are described throughout in nearly the same phraseology, as 1 Kings xi. 43; xiv. 20, 31; xv. 8, 24; xxii. 40; 2 Kings viii. 24; xiii. 9; xiv. 29; xv. 7, 38; xvi. 20; xx. 21; xxi. 18; xxiv. 6.

Expressions respecting the divine choice of the city of Jerusalem and the temple are interspersed, as in 1 Kings viii. 16, 29; ix. 3; xi. 36; xiv. 21; 2 Kings xxi. 4, 7.

The same proverbial language occurs in 1 Kings xiv. 10; xxi. 21; 2 Kings ix. 8; xiv. 26. In like manner the diction is tolerably uniform. The same forms of expression are used to denote the same thing, as *שָׁטַח וְעָצַר* *shut up and left*, 1 Kings xiv. 10; xxi. 21; 2 Kings ix. 8; xiv. 26; the frequent use of the particle *אָז* *then*, 1 Kings iii. 16; viii. 1, 12; ix. 11, 24; xi. 7; xvi. 21; xxii. 50; 2 Kings xii. 18; xiv. 8; xvi. 5. Most expressions belong to the later period of the language, as will be shewn hereafter.

But although the unity and independence of the work before us are attested by internal evidence, care must be taken to avoid such ideas of them as cannot stand a scrutiny. The books are a compilation from more copious documents, and therefore their unity cannot be very close or exact. It is true that one man has impressed upon them a peculiar character, shewing that he employed his sources with freedom and independence; yet we cannot assent to the assertion of De Wette, repeated with approval by Keil, that the insertion or putting together of different narratives does not clearly appear in any part.¹ That distinguished critic himself allows that the unity is disturbed in some pieces; because he instances 1 Kings xix. 15, etc., as not agreeing with 2 Kings viii. 7-15; ix. 1-10, as well as the isolated mention of Jonah in 2 Kings xiv. 25. *The kind of unity inherent in the books can only be determined by the phenomena themselves; and we believe that a rigid examination will shew a compilatory character, including an occasional looseness and want of harmony. Several traces of different writings are plainly seen, causing incoherence and diversity in the general narrative. Looking at the work as a whole we are inclined to demur to the language of such as attribute it to a single author. It belongs to one compiler. The correctness of this observation will appear from the following particulars.*

¹ Einleitung, p. 258.

1. Sometimes one part contradicts another. Thus in the prophecy of Elijah we read, "In the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine" (1 Kings xxi. 19); i.e., the place of punishment shall be Naboth's plot of ground in Jezreel; whereas according to 1 Kings xxii. 38, it was at Samaria. The prophecy lays stress upon the circumstance that *the place* acquired by murder should be *the place* of Ahab's violent death. No attempt to reconcile this diversity is successful, though after many others have failed, Keil seems confident of his. According to him, Jehu in 2 Kings ix. 26, quotes Elijah's prophecy according to the import not *the exact words* of it; and besides, it was only in part fulfilled literally upon Ahab himself, but fully on his son Joram.¹ This is a mere evasion of the difficulty; since the words properly understood convey but *one meaning*. We read in 1 Kings xxi. 29, that because Ahab humbled himself the evil threatened should not be inflicted in his days; and it remains to be shewn by Keil and his disciples that the evil deferred meant nothing more than that *the dogs should not lick his blood in Jezreel*. They *did* lick it in the pool of Samaria. After stating that the dogs licked up his blood, and that his armour had been washed in Samaria, the words occur, "according unto the word of the Lord which he spake" (1 Kings xxii. 38). Surely the reference here is to the evil inflicted on himself, *not postponed*. The evil deferred on his repentance, was not an alteration in the place of his death, but a *postponement of the utter destruction of his house*.

Again, Ahaziah son of Ahab is said to begin his reign in the seventeenth year of Jehoshaphat king of Judah (1 Kings xxii. 51). This does not agree with other statements, and must be incorrect. Ahab reigned twenty-two years. Jehoshaphat king of Judah began to reign in the fourth year of Ahab, i.e., the latter had reigned three years. If therefore Ahab's son became his successor in the seventeenth year of Jehoshaphat, the father could not have reigned more than nineteen or twenty. What makes the discrepancy still more apparent is, that from the beginning of Jehoshaphat's reign till the death of his grandson Ahaziah of Judah was thirty-four years, (25 + 8 + 1) (comp. 1 Kings xxii. 41, and 2 Kings viii. 17, 26); but Ahaziah of Israel reigned scarcely two years, and his brother Jehoram, contemporary with Ahaziah of Judah, reigned twelve years (2 Kings iii. 1). Subtracting fourteen years from thirty-four, we see that Ahaziah son of Ahab could not have succeeded to the throne till the twenty-first of Jehoshaphat.

2. Relations are represented as existing after the time when

¹ Einleitung, p. 184, second edition.

the history itself shews they were done away. Thus the historian speaks of the downfall of the Jewish kingdom, and retains the formula *until this day* of things which the catastrophe of the state did away. It is said of *the ark of the covenant* in the temple that it was there *unto this day* (1 Kings viii. 8); that Solomon levied a tribute of bond-service upon the original inhabitants of the land, *unto this day* (1 Kings ix. 21); that Israel rebelled against the house of David *unto this day* (1 Kings xii. 19); that Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah *unto this day* (2 Kings viii. 22); and that they brake down the image and house of Baal, turning it into a draught-house *unto this day* (2 Kings x. 27).

3. Ahab's conduct in sparing Benhadad (1 Kings xx. 34, etc.), which is regarded as a crime worthy of severe punishment, though commendable in itself, shews an incongruity between it and what *the man of God* had announced to the king beforehand (ver. 28), "I will deliver all this great multitude into thine hand," where it is never hinted that Ahab should spare none. If the crime of sparing Benhadad deserved such punishment, the man of God must have spoken differently from the words of the twenty-eighth verse. This is confirmed by the circumstance that *the same man of God* does not come to announce the punishment; but "a certain man of the sons of the prophets" (verse 35). Hence the conclusion seems unavoidable that xx. 35-43, did not belong to the preceding section at first. It does not certainly harmonise with it; and the attempt of Keil to bring it into conformity only demonstrates its impossibility.¹

4. The course of the narrative does not fulfil expectations for which the reader has been prepared. Thus in 1 Kings xix. 15-17, Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha were to be anointed by Elijah, and the remnant of Baal's worshippers to be killed by Elisha; whereas Hazael's anointing does not take place; Jehu's is not performed by Elijah; and none is slain by Elisha. The reply of Keil to this is frivolous.²

5. The same thing is repeated, as in 2 Kings xiv. 15, 16, which is very nearly identical with 2 Kings xiii. 12, 13, shewing different sources at the disposal of the redactor. Again, the same expedition of ships to Ophir sent by Solomon is related differently in 2 Kings ix. 27, 28, and x. 22. In like manner a useless repetition, supposing both to have proceeded from the same writer, occurs in 2 Kings ix. 14, 15, compared with 2 Kings viii. 28, 29.

6. Sections are separated from one another by intervening pieces. Thus 1 Kings ix. 24, is the continuation of iii. 3; and

¹ Einleitung, p. 185.

² Ibid.

all that intervenes is a kind of interruption. Keil arbitrarily affirms that it could not be put before its present place.¹ Again, xi. 41, is the continuation of x. 29. In 1 Kings vi. 11-13, the word of the Lord that came to Solomon is a strange insertion in a narrative respecting the particulars of building the temple. In like manner the account of Elisha's death (2 Kings xiii. 14-21) is appended to the close of Joash's history, though the prophet lived during the reign of Joash.

7. There is a considerable difference in the nature of the contents of the books; for while some bear the impress of genuine history, others are strongly imbued with the traditional and exaggerated. One has only to compare the accounts of the prophets Elijah and Elisha with such pieces as 1 Kings i. and ii. to see the diversity.

8. Sometimes the narrative spreads out into minute particulars; again it is chronicle-like, giving nothing more than leading notices of a general kind, as is observable in comparing 2 Kings xi. and xv.

9. Even in respect to language, diversities appear here and there. An antique style may be discovered, as in 1 Kings ix. 15-23; or a pregnant brevity of expression, as in the sections relating to Elijah and Elisha; or in peculiar words and their relations which betray diversity of conception and authorship.

These observations may serve to define the kind of unity belonging to the books of Kings—a unity consistent with their compilatory character, and influenced by it to a considerable extent. It is a unity which includes various diversities and some contradictions, consisting in general features and outline rather than minute particulars, and allowing the critic to detect in several instances different authorship of sections, inserted narratives, and occasional peculiarities of style.

IV. SOURCES.—The written sources employed by the author are, a *book of the acts of Solomon* סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי שְׁלֹמֹה (1 Kings xi. 41); a *book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel* סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (1 Kings xiv. 19; xv. 31; xvi. 5, 14, 20, 27; xxii. 39; 2 Kings i. 18; x. 34; xiii. 8, 12; xv. 11, 15, 21, 26, 31); a *book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah* סֵפֶר דְּבָרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה (1 Kings xiv. 29; xv. 7, 23; xxii. 46; 2 Kings viii. 23; xii. 19; xiv. 18, 28; xv. 6, 36; xvi. 19; xx. 20; xxi. 17; xxiii. 28; xxiv. 5). The *book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah* and the *book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel* seem to have been two leading divisions of a larger work which is quoted as a whole by the compiler of Chronicles in a

¹ Einleitung, p. 187.

variety of ways; as, *the book of the kings of Judah and Israel* (2 Chron. xvi. 11; xxv. 26; xxviii. 26); *the book of the kings of Israel and Judah* (2 Chron. xxvii. 7; xxxv. 27; xxxvi. 8); more briefly, *the book of the kings of Israel* (2 Chron. xxxiii. 18; xx. 34); *the story* (Midrash) *of the book of Kings* (2 Chron. xxiv. 27). It contained a history of the northern and southern kingdoms; as is evident from the name *book of the kings of Israel and Judah*, beginning with the reign of David. The last king of Judah mentioned in connexion with it is Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiv. 5; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 8); and the last king of Israel, Pekah (2 Kings xv. 31). It is probable, therefore, that the latest kings were not described in the work. The nature of it cannot be ascertained farther than the references in Kings and Chronicles warrant; but it appears to have narrated the lives and actions of the kings who ruled successively over the people. Various reasons might be assigned for denying it the character of *official journals* or annals committed to writing by the public recorders in both kingdoms, and preserved in the national archives. It was *compiled from* the official journals of the nation, but did not itself carry the weight or authority of such documents. It was not made by *official* scribes, nor had it a public official character, but was *extracted* by various individuals *from* the official records of the nation, everything being omitted which had no general historical importance. Accordingly in the narratives of the books of kings we do not find *the form* of journals recording events in accurate and minute succession from year to year, or the minute and trivial matters found in Oriental chronicles. The official annals had received a new shape, having been epitomised and altered before they came into the hands of the compiler of Kings in the aspect they presented in the book of the chronicles of Judah and Israel. The extracted document contained, not only a record of the chief acts of the kings, but also of the prophets and their influence on public affairs. The latter were so mixed up with the history of events and exerted so large an influence over them, as to necessitate more or less copious accounts of their doings, in any history of the nation which could lay claim to the name. The truth of this is apparent from the fact that *the book of Jehu the son of Hanani* (2 Chron. xx. 34); *the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz* (2 Chron. xxxii. 32); and *the words of the seers that spake to Manasseh in the name of the Lord God of Israel* (2 Chron. xxxiii. 18) are expressly said to be contained in *the book of the kings of Israel*. It has been inferred that when other prophetic writings are cited, they too belonged to the same larger work, though not expressly assigned to it like the preceding monographs. Thus when we read, "Now the rest of

the acts of Solomon first and last, are they not written in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and in the visions of Iddo the seer against Jeroboam, the son of Nebat" (2 Chron. ix. 29), it is supposed that there is an allusion to sections of the large work containing an account of these prophets in connexion with king Solomon. But the inference is uncertain and improbable. It is observable, that though the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah is cited fifteen times, and that of the chronicles of the kings of Israel sixteen times, both are never put together in Kings, as they are in Chronicles. This fact shews that the two journals were separate in the time of the compiler of Kings. He did not know them in their united form, as the chronicle-writer did; the latter always citing them as one work (2 Chron. xxvii. 7). After the extinction of the kingdom of Israel, the chronicles of *Judah* are always mentioned in the continuation of the history of Judah.

The book of the acts of Solomon (1 Kings xi. 41) is rightly thought by Keil never to have formed part of the work cited as *that of the kings of Israel and Judah*, etc., but to have been compiled earlier and to have remained an independent document.¹ It was in fact a private document, composed by some one after Solomon's death. Thenius² errs in supposing that though the author of the Kings had the document before him in its separate state, it was also incorporated in the larger work. That it formed a part of *the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Israel and Judah* cannot be fairly deduced from the probability of *the book of the acts of Solomon* being identical with that mentioned by the Chronicle-writer (2 Chron. ix. 29) *the book of Nathan the prophet*; for the life of the one could be written without that of the other, contrary to what Thenius asserts. There is no evidence that either *the book of Nathan the prophet* was identical with *that of the acts of Solomon*, as Thenius thinks; or that either formed part of the larger annals so often cited, as Bertheau imagines.³ Thenius infers from the manner in which the writer of Kings refers to the book he so often quotes, that the latter had not itself before him, but an abridgment or summary extracted from it.⁴ The particulars adduced in favour of this view do not appear to us convincing or weighty. The constantly recurring reference to a fuller written source in the case of each successive king need not be thought strange on the part of the writer of Kings; nor is it at all necessary to believe that, had he extracted his own account from the larger annals of

¹ Einleitung, page 189.

² Die Bücher der Könige, Einleitung, p. v.

³ Die Bücher der Chronik, Einleitung, p. xxxiv.

⁴ Ibid.

the nation, he would have contented himself with referring *once* to it as the source of fuller information. Movers's conjecture that the compiler used another source which he has not specified, viz., an older book of Kings (referred to in 1 Chron. ix. 1, 2 Chron. xx. 34, intermediate in date between contemporary annals and the compiler himself) is unnecessary.¹ The similarity in manner and language between 2 Sam. vii. and 1 Kings viii., which seems to be the critic's main reason for thinking so, is by no means characteristic.

Such are all the sources which appear to have been at the disposal of the compiler of Kings. Thenius indeed thinks it probable that besides *the book of the acts of Solomon* the writer had other single constituent parts of the larger work, as *the book of Jehu the son of Hanani* (2 Chron. xx. 34), from which he took 1 Kings xvi. 1-4; *the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite* (2 Chron. ix. 29), from which he got Ahijah's prophecy about Jeroboam, 1 Kings xi. 31-39; *the words of the seers* (2 Chron. xxxiii. 18), whence he derived the discourse to Manasseh, 2 Kings xxi. 12-15; but there is no good reason for thinking that such monographs had then formed part of *the book of the chronicles of the Kings* so often cited, if indeed they ever did.² At the commencement of his work the compiler had another source of information, viz., the books of Samuel in their original text, containing an account of David's sickness and death as well as a history of Solomon. These together with *the book of the acts of Solomon* served for the first part of his history; the lives of the succeeding kings being mostly derived from the large work containing an account of *the kings of Israel and Judah*, or at least from its two parts.

It is impossible to discover, at this remote period, the exact nature and plan of the work so often quoted by the writer of Kings. It was not a connected, continuous history the parts of which were regularly composed by one prophet after another, or by any other series of writers, one commencing where the other ceased. Rather was it made up, not long before the downfall of Judah, of materials and monographs which had accumulated in the progress of time. It began before the commencement of the two kingdoms, and narrated more or less fully the public acts of the kings and other leading personages. It was neither complete, nor alike valuable in all its parts.

Another source was *oral tradition*, from which were taken such pieces as 1 Kings iii. 16-28; 2 Kings xi. 1-13; and xxiii. 16-18. The history of Elijah and Elisha also shews very strongly the traditional element. But the sections relating to these prophets were

¹ Kritische Untersuchungen ueber d. Bibl. Chronik, p. 185.

² See Die Bücher der Könige, p. v.

not composed by the writer at first out of oral tradition.¹ They were taken from a historical work of a different character from that described as *the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah*. The legendary is too strongly incorporated with the matter of it to render it at all probable that it belonged to the annals of the nation. It is improbable that the two prophets were described at first in two distinct histories which were subsequently put together; nor is there any reason for thinking that the entire narration of both was taken from a document of a prophetic-historical tendency, unless it be held that the document contained more than the lives and actions of the prophets in question. The compiler of the Kings took the sections relating to these prophets from a document of another tendency than the chronicles of the kings of Judah and Israel. And it is most likely, that the original work to which the Elijah and Elisha accounts belonged was composed in the school of the prophets; since the tenor is to magnify the prophetic office. For that end the miraculous gathers around their persons. It has been remarked by Thenius,² that the compiler of Kings either omitted, or did not find, the beginning of the work whence he extracted the matter referred to; because Elijah appears at once on the stage without any preparatory mention, and in 1 Kings xviii. 4, there is allusion to something not previously noticed. Besides, Ahab appears in a more favourable light in the sections derived from the annals of the kingdom than in those borrowed from the document based on tradition. The sections taken from the document referred to are 1 Kings xvii.-xix. and xxi., 2 Kings i. 2-17, ii. 1-25, iv.-vii., viii. 1-15, xiii. 14-21. At the same time the histories of Elijah and Elisha were not written by one person, for they are conceived in a different spirit, and in each history itself various hands may be detected. Thus in that of Elijah, 2 Kings i. 2-17 could scarcely have proceeded from him who penned 1 Kings xvii.-xix., xxi. and 2 Kings ii. 1-18, but from a later hand who conceived of the prophet somewhat differently. A highly poetic spirit distinguishes 1 Kings xvii.-xix., xxi., 2 Kings ii. 1-18; not 2 Kings i. 2-17. We can also detect traces of various authors in the accounts given of Elisha. Thus 2 Kings ii. 19-20, iv., vi. 1-7, viii. 1-6 were not written by him who penned v., vi. 8-vii. 20, and viii. 7-15.

The compiler seems to have employed his sources freely and independently. He also used them with fidelity, making no arbitrary changes in them. Some things were allowed to stand without being adapted to his own time. Discrepancies were not

¹ See Ewald's *Geschichte d. V. Israel*, vol. i. p. 204 et seqq.

² *Die Bücher der Könige, Einleit.*, p. vi.

always removed. In some places where he might have done so with advantage, he did not alter the materials before him. The hand of the compiler is seen in 2 Kings xvii. 7-23 and 33-41, where he philosophises on the causes of the catastrophe before described, and points out the religious state of the mixed people called the Samaritans, in his day. Here his own subjectivity is prominent, and the lateness of the composition obvious. These are the longest, as they are the most obvious, portions written by the compiler himself without existing materials of any kind. Many brief remarks he has interspersed here and there.

V. DATE AND AUTHORSHIP.—The history is continued down to the time of Evilmerodach, terminating with an account of the liberation of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, from prison by that monarch (2 Kings xxv. 27). It was composed after the death of Jehoiachin (2 Kings xxv. 29), and perhaps after Evilmerodach's time, *i.e.*, in the second half of the captivity. There is no hint, however, of the return from Babylon; nor is any definite hope of it expressed. Hence the books were compiled between 561 and 536, B.C. From the language applied to Jehoiachin (he did eat bread continually before him [Evilmerodach] all the days of his life), it does not logically follow that he died before Evilmerodach, as Hävernicks thinks, relying on the fact that there is no mention of a succeeding Babylonian king. The work which formed the principal source of the compiler's materials was written before the downfall of the Jewish State, because it is plainly indicated in itself that the kingdom still existed (2 Kings viii. 22). The oft-recurring formula, *unto this day*, which belonged to the same source and never implies the time of the exile but the later period of the kingdom of Judah, corroborates the same conclusion. It is also plain that the document itself terminated with Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiv. 5). If however he died after Evilmerodach, it must still have been before the end of the captivity, as Ewald observes.¹

In regard to the date of particular parts or sections, it is difficult to determine it. They belong to very different times; and which of them is the oldest is doubtful. It is probable that some belong to the time of Solomon, as 1 Kings i., ii., iv. 2-19. Some were written before the captivity of Israel or the ten tribes; others, before the downfall of Judah. The accounts of Elijah and Elisha were composed latest, as may be inferred from their legendary character, the absence in them of exact dates and places, and geographical anomalies, as in 1 Kings xix. 8, where Elijah is represented as travelling uninterruptedly *forty days and forty nights* from Beersheba to Horeb; whereas the

¹ Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. i. p. 213.

distance is little more than forty geographical miles. Yet he is represented as going forward in the strength of the meat which had been miraculously supplied to him. In 1 Kings xviii. 46, it is stated that the hand of the Lord was upon Elijah, and he girded up his loins and ran before Ahab to the entrance of Jezreel, *i.e.*, extraordinarily strengthened, he ran before Ahab from Carmel to the entrance of Jezreel, a distance not less than six geographical miles.

With the date assigned to the work agrees the later Chaldaising character of the language as **אָתִי** for **את**, 1 Kings xiv. 2; 2 Kings iv. 16, 23; viii. 1. **אָתוֹ** for **אתו**, 2 Kings i. 15; iii. 11, 12; viii. 8. **אָתֶם** for **אתם**, 2 Kings vi. 16. **גֵּר** for **גֵּר**, 1 Kings xi. 36; xv. 4; 2 Kings viii. 19. **לָךְ** for **לְךָ**, 2 Kings iv. 2. **לָךְ** for **לְךָ**, 2 Kings iv. 7. **רָצִין**, 2 Kings xi. 13. **צִדוֹנִין**, 1 Kings xi. 33. **מְרִינֹת**, 1 Kings xx. 14, etc. **חָרִים**, 1 Kings xxi. 8, 11. **כָּר** for **חָמַר**, 1 Kings v. 2. **בַּהֲשָׁרָה**, 2 Kings vii. 12. **סָבִיב**, 2 Kings viii. 21. **פָּחָה**, 1 Kings x. 15; xx. 24. 2 Kings xviii. 24. **רַב־טַבָּחִים**, 2 Kings xxv. 8. **נָשָׁלַם**, 1 Kings viii. 61, etc. **מִשְׁלָנוּ**, 2 Kings vi. 11. **הַשְּׂבִיל**, 2 Kings xviii. 7. **בְּטָחוֹן**, 2 Kings xviii. 19. **יְהוּדִית**, 2 Kings xviii. 26. **שָׂרֵי הַחֲיָלִים**, 1 Kings xv. 20; 2 Kings xxv. 23, 26. **הַיָּד**, 2 Kings xxv. 1. **רָבַר מִשְׁפַּט אֵת**, 2 Kings xxv. 6. **הַתִּמְכָּר**, **לַעֲשׂוֹת הָרַע**, 1 Kings xxi. 20, 25; 2 Kings xvii. 17. **נָהַר**, 1 Kings xviii. 42; 2 Kings iv. 34, 35; the frequent use of the preterite with **ו** as a narrative tense, etc. etc.

The same date is corroborated by the circumstance of the legendary being found in the history, pointing to a considerable interval between the time when certain events happened, and the recording of them. Contemporary or immediately succeeding writers could not have presented various parts of the history as they now appear; the original annals must have been subsequently cast into a new form, abridged in part, and enlarged by minute insertions drawn from popular tradition or report. It is true that these remarks apply more to the document cited by the compiler as his main source, *i.e.*, the book of the chronicles of the kings; but the late date of that abridgment is closely connected with the late date of the present work.

According to the Talmudists, followed by many of the older theologians, Jeremiah was the compiler of the books of Kings. This opinion has been adopted in modern times by Hävernicks¹

¹ Einleitung, II. i. p. 171 et seqq.

and Graf,¹ who rely on such considerations as these: The same gloomy prophetic view of history in both (comp. especially 2 Kings xvii. 11, etc. with Jer. xxiii. 4, etc.); the frequent verbal agreement between both, as in xvii. 14 compared with Jer. vii. 26; xvii. 15 compared with Jer. ii. 5; xvii. 20 compared with Jer. vii. 15; the surprising harmony between Jer. xxxix. 1, etc. and 2 Kings xxv. 1, etc.; the favourite idea of both respecting the choice and continuance of David's house conveyed in the same words, לֹא יָבֹרַת אִישׁ מֵעַל כִּסֵּא דָוִד (comp. 1 Kings ii. 4; viii. 25; ix. 5 with Jer. xxxiii. 17; xiii. 13; xvii. 25; xxii. 4); in both the same propensity to borrow modes of speech from the Pentateuch; the attachment to earlier prophecies and a careful use of them for history (comp. Deut. xiii. 8; 2 Kings xxiii. 26; Jer. iv. 8); the idea of the choice of Jerusalem, taken from the Pentateuch (Deut. xii. 11, etc.) and forming a prominent fundamental idea in the two writers; and the close agreement of 2 Kings xxiv. 18, etc. with Jer. lii.

Most of these peculiarities are accounted for by the similarity of the times to which the respective writers belonged. Indeed they were not far from being contemporary. Both belonged to the learned class, and were well acquainted with the sacred books of their people. And the writer of Kings made use of Jeremiah in particular. The similarity existing between Jer. lii. and 2 Kings xxiv. 18, etc., has been differently explained. According to Hävernicks, Jeremiah himself put the latter where it now stands, while the persons who collected his prophecies, thinking the narrative worth preserving, appended it to the book called after him.² This is a most unlikely supposition. Neither is it probable that the redactor of Jeremiah's book took the section from Kings and put it to the end of the prophetic book, because it is a fuller recension of 2 Kings xxiv. instead of a briefer one. Both were taken from a common source, as would appear from their differences as well as their general similarity; the form in Jeremiah lii. being the purer representative of the original. It is no valid objection when Hävernicks adduces the fact that the annals of the kingdom whence the compiler of Kings drew ceased with Jehoiakim (2 Kings xxiv. 5, etc.), because he was not necessarily confined to them for his information. Much more probable is the hypothesis of Bleek, that Baruch added the last chapter of Jeremiah.³

Huetius and Calmet supposed that Ezra was the writer. In favour of this conjecture the latter adduces various particulars

¹ De librorum Sam. et Reg. compositione. etc., p. 61 et seqq.

² Einleitung II., i. p. 173.

³ See his Einleitung, p. 369.

which are as suitable to any other person living at that time. None of them marks out Ezra as the person.

Jahn conjectures that Ezekiel wrote the books before us, but admits that there is no ground for the assumption.

It is useless to try to discover the person. We must be content with a few general circumstances relating to him. He belonged to Judah not Israel, as is inferred from his going much more into detail in matters affecting the southern kingdom, and his describing the history of Israel in a more summary way; from his zeal on behalf of the public worship of Jehovah at Jerusalem; and his tracing all the disasters of the state to the apostacy of the ten tribes under Jeroboam (2 Kings xvii. 21). An *anti-Israelitish* spirit is very observable in him. From the prophetic survey of history presented in the work, the writer was in some way connected with the order of prophets. It is certain that he belonged to the learned class, and was intimately acquainted with the sacred literature of his nation. Though not a prophet himself, he may have been the pupil of one; of Jeremiah himself, as Thenius conjectures,¹ which would amply explain the similarity of thought and style existing between the pupil and master. He belonged to the captives who had been carried away to Babylon, or at least lived there at the time he wrote. This appears from 1 Kings v. 4 (English iv. 24), where in describing Solomon's dominions the compiler says "he had dominion over all the region on this side the river." The expression עֶבֶר הַנָּהָר can only mean *on the west side* of the Euphrates, used by one dwelling on the east side of it. The English version is incorrect. The same conclusion follows from 2 Kings xxv. 27-29. Whatever circumstances may seem to favour Egypt as the place of composition, must give way to the clear indication of the two passages now referred to.

It has been already shewn that the books of Samuel were not written by the person who compiled those of the Kings. Hence it is matter of surprise that Thenius should sanction the opinion. Ewald has unduly influenced him in this respect.

VI. NATURE OF THE HISTORY.—The genuine character of the books is well attested by internal evidence. A true theocratic spirit pervades them. The compiler often refers to his sources, shewing that he was exact and faithful. His conscientious scrupulousness in relation to chronology is apparent to such an extent that the numbers assigned to the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah do not agree with one another. Instead of removing such discrepancies and so introducing full harmony into the chronology of the two kingdoms, he has

¹ Die Bücher der Könige, Einleit., p. x.

allowed them to remain. This is a proof of his closely following the materials at his disposal. The general credibility of the history is confirmed by a comparison of the analogous accounts in Chronicles, which must have been drawn more or less directly from the same sources. The partialities of the author are scarcely apparent in the living traits of character he presents. Causes and consequences are stated with simplicity and brevity. Though the history is compendious and extract-like, it bears on its face the stamp of fidelity. As might be expected from one living in Babylon where his countrymen were captive, the view taken of events is gloomy. But it is not so dark as to beget or cherish despair; on the contrary it encourages the down-trodden Israelites with the hope of a bright future, when they should worship God in His temple, and acknowledge His faithfulness to David's house.

Here and there traces of the legendary and exaggerated may be seen. Thus it is said that the children of Israel slew of the Syrians in one day 100,000 foot (1 Kings xx. 29); that Solomon had 70,000 who bore burdens in preparing for the building of the temple (1 Kings v. 15); and that Hiram sent to Solomon 120 talents of gold—nearly 5,000,000*l.* sterling. Sometimes the miraculous is unnecessarily introduced, as when Elijah supplied with food by an angel went in the strength of it forty days and forty nights, from Beersheba to Horeb (1 Kings xix. 8). It is evident that in the narrative of this prophet at Horeb, the writer copied Ex. xxxiii. 11-23, where the miraculous is accumulated. So also in 2 Kings xx. 8-11, where it is said that Jehovah "brought the shadow ten degrees backward, by which it had gone down in the dial of Ahaz;" as if the Almighty would work such a miracle to satisfy Hezekiah's mind of the certainty of an event which he would have to wait for only three days, and which God himself assured him of by the prophet Isaiah. Something simple and natural was transformed by a later age into the miraculous. The writer faithfully reflects the view of his own time in the words: "And Isaiah the prophet cried unto the Lord: and he brought the shadow ten degrees backward." The prophetic-didactic tendency is so predominant as to have deteriorated the character of the history in various parts. The compiler interposes his own reflections as he proceeds. Taking a prophetic survey he connects later occurrences with earlier prophecies, leaving room for arbitrariness. Compare for example 1 Kings ii. 27, with 1 Sam. ii. 31, 33; 1 Kings xi. 30, 31, with xii. 15; xiii. 2, with 2 Kings xxiii. 15-20; 1 Kings xiv. 10, with xv. 29; 1 Kings xvi. 1-3, with 12; 1 Kings xvi. 34, with Josh. vi. 26; 1 Kings xxi. 19, 24, with xxii. 38; 2 Kings

ix. 36, 37, with x. 10; 2 Kings x. 30, with xv. 12; 2 Kings xx. 16-18, with xxi. 10, etc., etc., xxii. 16, etc., etc.; 2 Kings xxiii. 27, with xxv. There is also a considerable similarity between the prophetic discourses and deeds recorded; shewing that his own subjectivity found some scope. It is a striking circumstance, for instance, that Ahijah should address Jeroboam (1 Kings xiv. 7, etc.), Jehu, Baasha (1 Kings xvi. 1, etc.), Elijah, Ahab (1 Kings xxi. 19, etc.), a young prophet, Jehu (2 Kings ix. 7, etc.), in words much alike. Hence it is probable that these prophecies received their present form subsequently to the time they were delivered; and that they are not given exactly. The remarkable analogy subsisting between them, extending even to the language, is a phenomenon best explained in this way. But we do not believe that the compiler's subjectivity was allowed *much* license, because he was mainly dependent on written sources, and did not possess much original genius. He lived at a period of the national history unfavourable to the production of the best Hebrew history-writing. Traditional elements had incorporated themselves with the annals of the nation too firmly to be accurately separated; the legendary and exaggerated, the mythological and marvellous had intruded into the domain of genuine history, in some cases too strongly to be dislodged from it, at least by one of the Israelites themselves. And the writer was too remote from many of the persons and events described to view them otherwise than through the glass of a degenerate time, at which the darkness of the present tended to throw too bright a halo round the old national monarchs and conquerors.

The history of Solomon, though mostly historical in the best sense of the term, has something of the legendary and traditional in it. His wisdom is extolled very highly; and divine revelations are made to him on two occasions. But the nature of his government does not justify the great encomiums passed upon his wisdom; nor does his character accord with the religious stand-point he occupies. His prayer at the dedication of the temple contains later ideas, and has been enlarged by a subsequent hand to its present state, out of a much shorter basis. Thus 1 Kings viii. 46-51 was evidently suggested by the Babylonish captivity, and could not have proceeded from Solomon himself. There is also an allusion to a much later custom in the forty-fourth and forty-eighth verses—viz., the turning toward Jerusalem in the public worship of Jehovah. It is likewise apparent that there are imitations of passages in Deuteronomy and Joshua. The style is wordy in many places, and full of later expressions. Hence, though there is an original groundwork bearing the stamp of authenticity, it has been consider-

ably enlarged and elaborated by a hand later than Solomon's time. The number of sacrifices and peace-offerings is also excessive in viii. 62-64, considering that so many were offered in seven days. The same remark applies to the number of women in his harem—viz. 1000. In the Song of Solomon the number is very much less, sixty queens and eighty concubines; while to Rehoboam are assigned in Chronicles eighteen wives and sixty concubines. Again, the accounts of Elijah and Elisha, though they have a genuine historical basis, are strongly tinged with the legendary. The reader is struck with the great similarity between 1 Kings xvii. 8, etc., where Elijah goes to a widow; and 2 Kings iv. 1, etc., where Elisha goes to a widow; and between 1 Kings xx. relating to the former prophet, and 2 Kings vi. 24 relating to the latter. In like manner, there is an analogy between 2 Kings i. where Elijah's great zeal appears, and 2 Kings ii. 23, 24, where Elisha is depicted in the same way. It is also observable, that angels appear only in connexion with the history of these prophets; and that disobedience to the word of God or the prophet is twice punished by a lion. Indeed the miraculous which is so largely interspersed discovers its origin in the popular legends and traditions. Thus Elijah declared to Ahab, that there should neither be dew nor rain for succeeding years except as he should order it; and accordingly a drought came and lasted more than *two* years (1 Kings xvii. 1 and xviii. 1); with which the New Testament account of its continuance does not agree (Luke iv. 25; James v. 17). He was fed by ravens. Elisha caused the head of an axe to rise to the top of water by throwing in a stick. The scene in which Elijah appeared on mount Carmel with the Baal prophets summoned to meet him is dramatic. It is not easy to separate what is historical in it from the drapery with which it has been enveloped. Sometimes the fictitious is apparent, as where abundance of water is used by the prophet to drench his sacrifice and the wood, by surrounding the altar; while Elijah filled the trench also with water. This profuse application of water is introduced for the purpose of enhancing the greatness of the miracle. But the writer seems to have forgot for the moment the long-continued drought, which, as it had lasted for more than two years, must have dried up the brooks belonging to the mountain, and the river Kishon supplied by them. Even at and after death, the wonder-loving tradition of the age to which the writers belonged invested the two prophets with miracle. Thus Elijah is said to have been taken up to heaven in a chariot and horses of fire, without undergoing death (2 Kings ii. 11); and the very bones of Elisha in the grave reanimated a dead body as soon as it touched them (2 Kings xiii. 21).

VII. GENERAL SCOPE.—The general scope of the writer was to exhibit the development of the theocracy in conformity with the principle contained in the divine promise made to David: "And when thy days be fulfilled and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men. — But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever" (2 Sam. vii. 12-16). Accordingly the history before us shews how God preserved the kingdom of Solomon entire; and, after its division, endeavoured to recal both Israel and Judah to a sense of their relation to Himself by admonitions and chastisements, until their continued rebellion subverted them. That subversion, however, was not the extinction of David's seed. It was a severe and salutary chastisement. The exiled king Jehoiachin was brought back to Judea and elevated again to kingly honour in his own land, as an evidence that Jehovah remembered His servant David and the promises made to him. The seed of David was always to occupy the throne. Amid the sorest disasters, when the mercy of God might seem to have forsaken his people utterly, the promise of perpetual sovereignty was not invalidated. In following out this general scope, the compiler presents the history of his suffering nation as an instructive example fraught with wholesome warning; though that was not his leading object. He also encourages his fellow-exiles to cherish a firm trust in God, and a steadfast adherence to His worship. The *tendency* of the work is *prophetic-didactic*, as Hävernicks terms it. Not that the writer's principal design was to set forth the activity and influence of the prophets in national affairs, but that his reflections in narrating the history have a *prophetic character*. In performing his work, the compiler could hardly refrain from noticing, more or less fully, the sayings and doings of the prophets, because those inspired men occupied a prominent place in the theocracy. They watched over the interests of the people, checked royal usurpation and excesses, exerted an administrative power as the representatives of Jehovah, and controlled to some extent all the affairs of the nation. Hence they could not be ignored in any history of Israel or Judah, because their influence was so extensive over the theocracy. But in the manner of describing the prophets and looking at national affairs, the com-

piler magnifies their persons, representing unconditional obedience to them as tantamount to unqualified submission to God. His stand-point is neither the *religious* nor *ecclesiastical*, but the *prophetic*. This is well exemplified in the mode of speaking of Jeroboam's general conduct in relation to public worship: "After this thing Jeroboam returned not from his evil way, but made again of the lowest of the people priests of the high places: whosoever would, he consecrated him, and he became one of the priests of the high places. And this thing became sin unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off, and to destroy it off the face of the earth" (1 Kings xiii. 33, 34). Another striking example is in 2 Kings xxiv. 20, where we read, "for through the anger of the Lord it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah, until he had cast them out from his presence, that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon." Such hard, *prophetic* pragmatism is characteristic. The same tendency is prominent in the reflections contained in 2 Kings xviii. 26, 27, which are based on the prophecies of Zephaniah (ch. i.) and Jeremiah (xxv., xxvi.).

VIII. THE PROPHETS IN 1 KINGS xxii. 6.—The 400 prophets collected by Ahab king of Israel at the instigation of Jehoshaphat, that the divine will might be known respecting the issue of an expedition against Ramoth-gilead, have been very variously judged of. Perhaps the most common view is that they were *false* prophets, either those connected with Baal, or the 400 Astarte-prophets who had not gone to Carmel and consequently escaped destruction. Others think that they were priests, who presided over the worship of the golden calves which Jeroboam established in the kingdom of Israel. Neither of these hypotheses is correct. True prophets are meant, as appears from the seventh verse, "Is there not here a prophet of the Lord besides?" and also from the twenty-fourth verse, "Which way went the Spirit of the Lord from me to speak unto thee?" Why then, it may be asked, did they give advice contrary to the issue? Why was their utterance false? Did they speak solely from the natural impulse of their own minds, without spiritual perception or divine instinct? We dare not affirm that they were forsaken by the Spirit in giving the advice they did. Nor should we say that they had not a truer intimation of the future. What they said was spoken from patriotism and a feeling of justice; for Ramoth in Gilead was unrighteously held by Benhadad, and belonged to Ahab. The vision which Micahiah had of the spirit going forth from Jehovah (1 Kings xxii. 19, et seqq.) is the personified spirit of prophecy which may, with the divine permission, be a *spirit of deception*. Of course the vision shadows forth the ideas of the prophet, or rather

those of his time respecting the spiritual world. The scenery employed is prophetic, conceived in the genius of prophetism as it existed at that time. The fact that Elijah, the greatest of all the prophets in the days of Ahab, was not once thought of when the will of the Lord was inquired, merely shews that the writer of this twenty-second chapter was different from the author of xvii.-xix.

IX. ELISHA'S CONDUCT TO THE CHILDREN.—In 2 Kings ii. 23, 24, are these words: "And he [Elisha] went up from thence unto Bethel: and as he was going up by-the way, there came forth little children out of the city and mocked him, and said unto him, Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head. And he turned back and looked on them and cursed them in the name of the Lord. And there came forth two she-bears out of the wood, and tare forty and two children of them."

A charge of revenge and cruelty has been brought against Elisha for imprecating destruction on the children. To defend the prophet against it, great pains have been taken by y-pologists. We shall content ourselves with a few remarks on the occurrence.

First. The incident does not appear historical, at least in various particulars. It is wholly improbable that she-bears would come out of the wood to devour children, in answer to the imprecation of a prophet.

Secondly. Supposing the statement to be literally true that Elisha was mocked by children as he went up the street of Bethel, and that he turned round to curse them, it shews a sudden ebullition of passion unwarranted by the provocation. It was both cruel and revengeful for him to curse them. The prophets were but men, and sometimes sinned like others. This is an example of unjustifiable anger if the thing be historical. Why should attempts be made to excuse what is inexcusable?

Thirdly. Most of the attempts framed to justify the passionate conduct of the prophet do violence to the plain words of the passage as well as to morality, and are unworthy of their authors. Thus the term עַרְבָּנִים is said to mean *grown up persons*. In this way *children* disappear from the narrative, and *men* take their place. Three things, all incorrect, are asserted in favour of the new version of עַרְבָּנִים, viz., that it is applied to Isaac when he was twenty-eight years old; to Joseph when he was thirty; and to Rehoboam when he was forty years of age. There is neither reason nor necessity for altering the sense of the word, which is applied to an *infant*, to a *boy not full grown*, and to a *youth nearly twenty years old*. Whatever their age might have been, it made no difference in regard to the immorality of the impre-

cation. If they were *men*, the curse invoked was an immoral thing ; if they were *children* it was more immoral.

Fourthly. It is said that Elisha cursed them *in the name of the Lord*. That makes the case far worse than if he had *simply* cursed them. Strange to say, however, apologists take that to be an indication that he did not act from any petulant temper of his own, but declared in God's name and authority the punishment which *He* would inflict upon them. This interpretation is a perverted one. Nothing can be farther from the truth than to affirm that Elisha acted in this instance as a minister of the Supreme Governor of the world ; and that the denunciation proceeded in consequence from a divine impulse. The assertion is derogatory to the character of God, who neither inspires nor sanctions the imprecation of punishment pronounced by man against man.

Fifthly. Apologists invent a number of things which are foreign to the narrative, for the purpose of throwing blame on the children ; such as, they belonged to an idolatrous town and were therefore wicked idolaters themselves. They insulted the prophet *at the instigation of the priests of Baal*. They alluded to Elijah's ascension to heaven, which they had heard of, but did not believe. These assertions are baseless. Wanton children mocked the prophet who was bald at the back of the head. Children are prone to deride those who have any outward defect of body, or an appearance commonly associated with contempt. They surrounded the prophet, who was probably climbing very slowly the street of the hill on which Bethel was built, crying, 'Go up, thou bald head.' The ascension of Elijah is not alluded to. It is the ascent of Elisha up the hill of Bethel.

Sixthly. We reject the idea altogether that "some miracle was necessary to support the character and office" of Elisha. Neither his character nor office was derided. No miracle was necessary to bring a curse to pass. Rather would it have been necessary to thwart it. Nor was a miracle performed. The connexion of the she-bears with the malediction is legendary.

THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES.

I. NAME.—The Hebrew name of the Chronicles is literally meaning, *words of the days, transactions of the days or annals*. In the Hebrew canon they formed one book, which the Greek translators divided into two, with the title *παραλειπόμενα*, signifying *things omitted*, because, as the author of the synopsis of sacred Scripture in the works of Athanasius writes, “many things omitted in the Kings are contained in them;” or rather as Movers¹ explains the title, *supplements, remains of other historical works*. The common name *chronicles* is from the Latin *chronicon*, which Jerome first used, “*Verba dierum, quod significantius chronicon totius divinae historiae possumus appellare, qui liber apud nos Paralipomenon primus et secundus inscribitur.*”² The example of the Septuagint was followed by the Vulgate in dividing the work into two; and Daniel Bomberg introduced it into his editions of the Hebrew Bible; so that it is now current in the original text. Little inconvenience has followed from the separation, though we should prefer to have the whole printed together continuously.

II. CONTENTS.—The books of Chronicles may be divided into two parts as follows:—

1. Chapters i.–ix. 34.
2. Chapters ix. 35–2 Chron. xxxvi.

The former consists of genealogical lists interspersed with short historical notices; the latter of the history of the kings in Jerusalem from David to Zedekiah. These again may be subdivided thus:

1. (a) Chapters i.–iii., the registers connecting Adam with David; together with the descendants of the latter till Elioenai and his seven sons.

(b) Chapters iv.–vii., genealogical registers of the twelve tribes of Israel.

¹ Untersuchungen ueber die biblische Chronik, pp. 95, 96.

² Prologus galeatus.

(c) Chapters viii.-ix. 34, genealogical lists of the families in Jerusalem.

2. (a) ix. 35-xxix. contains the history of David, introduced by a brief account of Saul's pedigree, and the downfall of his house.

(b) 2 Chron. i.-ix. is occupied with the history of Solomon.

(c) 2 Chron. x.-xxxvi. contains a history of the kings in Jerusalem, from Rehoboam to Zedekiah.

More particularly, the contents are these.

The first four verses contain the names of thirteen members of the earliest period of the world's history, according to the fifth chapter of Genesis, from Adam to Noah and his sons. The next nineteen verses contain the seventy races or nations from the tenth chapter of Genesis, with the omission of the short historical and geographical notices which appear in Gen. x. 1, 5, 9-12, 18b.-20, 21, 30-32. The posterity of Japhet are fourteen, those of Ham thirty, and those of Shem twenty-six; making up the seventy races sprung from Noah's three sons. The next four verses (i. 24-27) give the names of the ten members of the second period of the world's history—viz., from Shem to Abraham, agreeably to the account in Gen. xi. 10-32. The historical notices connected with these names in Genesis are omitted. The succeeding fourteen verses (i. 29-42) give the seventy descendants of Abraham beginning with the twelve sons of Ishmael, extracted from the corresponding record in Genesis. The remainder of the chapter (i. 43-54) contains a catalogue of the kings that reigned in Edom before the beginning of kingly power in Israel; and also the dukes of Edom. These are from the thirty-sixth chapter of Genesis, with some variations.

The second chapter enumerates the twelve tribes of Israel, and the seventy descendants of Judah. The posterity of one of them, Zerah, is somewhat fully noticed; but more fully the descendants of Hezron Zerah's nephew, because he was progenitor of the house of David. Here Caleb is called the son of Hezron (ver. 18). Chelubai in the ninth verse is only another form of the same name, though Ewald thinks that they are names of different persons.¹ But it is evident that the chronicler identifies Chelubai (9) and Caleb (vers. 18, 42); for both are represented as the son of Hezron and brother of Jerahmeel. Hence it is more probable that one Caleb is referred to in the chapter than two of the same name. The name of the father being Jephunneh in Joshua and Hezron here, need not create much difficulty.

¹ *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. i. p. 471, second edition.

The third chapter contains a list of David's posterity, with the descendants of his son Solomon in the royal line of Judah; and some of the posterity of Jeconiah the last king but one.

The fourth chapter begins with the patriarch Judah and his sons, or rather families sprung from him (1-23). This list appears to be incomplete. Whether it was compiled from defective materials, or put together carelessly, cannot now be determined; but some parts of it are unintelligible as they stand, for example, the seventeenth and eighteenth verses. In 21-23 the posterity of Shelah are given separately, perhaps as a sort of appendix. Notices in connexion with the names are very few. Of Jabez (9, 10) an anecdote is recorded; and the occupations of a few others are mentioned (14, 21, 23). Simeon and his sons are next given (24-33). Here the notices are more copious; an account of the settlement of the tribe in Canaan being furnished, with a notice of some families distinguished for fecundity; and the conquests made by the tribe at the end of the eighth century. The next tribe whose genealogy is given is that of Reuben, whose four sons are specified in Genesis and Numbers. The race of Reuben is then continued in one line viz. that of Joel, who seems to have lived about the time of David, and of whose posterity we have seven generations, down to Beerah who was prince of the Reubenites at the time of the Assyrian conquest. The notices of the Reubenites conclude with a short account of a successful war with the Hagarites in the time of Saul, by which means they extended their possessions beyond the eastern border of Gilead (v. 1-10). Genealogical accounts of the tribe of Gad follow (v. 11-22). Here the descendants mentioned in Gen. xlv. 16 do not appear, but a series of twelve names (twelfth and thirteenth verses). The names given were probably taken from two lists composed in the times of Jotham king of Judah and Jeroboam king of Israel respectively (verse 17). To the genealogy of Gad is appended a brief notice of a successful warlike expedition undertaken by the two and a half tribes east of Jordan against the Hagarites. Both the number of men composing the joint force, and the great booty carried off by the victors are specified. Gad, Reuben, Manasseh continued to occupy the territory thus obtained, till they were carried away captive by Tilgath-Pilneser into Assyria. The verses in question (18-22) would have been in a more suitable place after the twenty-fourth, where the half-tribe of Manasseh is spoken of. The twenty-third and twenty-fourth verses relate to the half-tribe of Manasseh; and the last two verses of the chapter to the exile of the two and a half tribes.

The tribe of Levi is more fully described in its genealogy

than any other of the series (v. 26-vi. 66). In the first place the connexion between Aaron and Levi is shewn; there is next an uninterrupted series of twenty-two names, from Eleazar son and successor of Aaron to Jehozadak, who was carried captive to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar. It is remarkable that according to the view of the writer the high priesthood continued in unbroken succession in the line of Eleazar to the Chaldean exile; whereas we learn from other places in the Old Testament, that the high priesthood was in the line of Ithamar from Eli down to Abiathar, from whom Solomon took it to give to Zadok of the line of Eleazar. Perhaps the conjecture of Bertheau is the most probable, that both lines filled the high priesthood in different places at the same time; because the Israelitish church was divided, and the Mosaic constitution not strictly carried out.¹ In vi. 1-4, the names of the sons of Levi are given again; and three series of the posterity of Gershom, Kohath, and Merari (5-15), which lead to Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, the three celebrated Levites in the time of David. From 16-34 we have the ancestors of the same renowned Levites given in a different way. From Heman to Levi are twenty-two generations; from Asaph to Levi fourteen are given; while in that of Ethan only twelve are specified. After speaking of the other posterity of Levi who did not belong to the priestly lines of Aaron, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan (verses 33, 34), the succession of the pontifical race from Eleazar to Ahimaaz contemporary with David (35-38) is presented. Here there is a repetition of the twelve names already given in v. 30-34. This is followed by an account of the dwelling places of the Levites within the boundaries belonging to the individual families (39-66). The contents of verses 42-45 are found again in Josh. xxi. 13, 19. The cities of the Kohathites, Gershomites, and Merarites are enumerated; but there is great difficulty in verses 49 and 50, as well as in reconciling the corresponding accounts in Joshua with those of the Chronicles. The list in Josh. xxi. must be regarded as more correct than the present, when the two come in conflict, as they do in some instances, or vary, as in others. The first five verses of the seventh chapter contain a genealogical record of the tribe of Issachar, followed by a similar list of Benjamin (verses 6-11). Three sons of Benjamin are specified. In Gen. xvi. ten appear; and in Num. xxvi. 38, five. In the list given below (viii. 1, etc.) there are also five, but different from those in Num. xxvi. It is now impossible to reconcile these accounts. They must relate to different periods of time, and different branches of the same line. The twelfth verse *seems* to refer to

¹ Die Bücher der Chronik. pp. 61, 62.

Dan, yet his name is not given. In the same manner he is omitted in vi. 46 (comp. Josh. xxi. 5) ; vi. 54 (comp. Josh. xxi. 23). Hushim is *apparently* the name of Dan's son in Genesis (xli. 23) ; here Hushim is called the son of Aher. Is Aher a disguised appellation for Dan ? So Bertheau conjectures. But we learn from Num. xxvi. 42, that Dan's son was called *Shuham*, not *Hushim*. The latter belonged to Benjamin (1 Chron. viii. 8, 11). By comparing viii. 8, we see that the word *Aher* (אהר) should be שחר, *Shahar*. It is a proper name ; not the adjective אחר *another*. The tribe of Dan is omitted, because the accounts from which the Chronist drew were defective in places. The thirteenth verse of ch. vii. notices the tribe of Naphtali, where four names are given, substantially the same as in Gen. xli. 24 and Num. xxvi. 48, 49. The half tribe of Manasseh follows (14-19). Here the fourteenth and fifteenth verses, especially the latter, are unintelligible as they now stand. The text is evidently incomplete and corrupt. Ashriel, in verse 14, should probably be expunged ; for Ashriel belonged to the sons of Gilead, the son of Machir, Manasseh's son. In the fifteenth verse it is stated that Machir took to wife Huppim and Shuppim ; the names of men whose sister in the next verse appears as Machir's wife. The verse must be corrupt. The tribe of Ephraim is next treated of genealogically (vii. 20-29). The posterity of Shuthelah is traced through seven members, the name occurring twice, as well as that of Tahath. The passage *appears* at first sight to set forth that Ephraim lived to see and bewail the misfortunes of his posterity in the seventh generation. But the true sense is, that the tribe, represented as one body, bewailed the disaster which befel two of its *sons*, i.e., *two divisions* of it. A genealogical list of Asher follows (vii. 30-40). It is remarkable that Zebulun is entirely omitted in the list of the tribes. No good reason can be given for such omission ; and therefore some conjecture that it arose from the oversight of transcribers, who omitted a few words respecting Zebulun which stood in the original text. It is better to acquiesce in our ignorance of the true cause which led the Chronicle-writer to pass over this tribe, than resort to so rash and groundless a conjecture. Dan too is unmentioned by name. If chap. vii. 12 do not relate to him, he is wholly omitted. The tribe of Judah comes first, as that to which David belonged. The small tribe of Simeon is mentioned next, because of its close connexion with Judah. Reuben the first born succeeds, and with him the other tribes beyond Jordan. Levi is described very fully, followed by short notices of Issachar, Benjamin, Naphtali, the other half of Manasseh,

Ephraim, and Asher. Naphtali is very briefly touched upon (vii. 13).

The eighth and ninth chapters give a survey of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, with other accounts interspersed relating to the Benjamites, the posterity of the father of Gibeon who dwelt in Jerusalem, and to the race of Saul and the Levites. It is difficult to discover the time to which this description of the inhabitants of Jerusalem refers. Some, as Ewald,¹ think that it refers to about thirty years before the overthrow of the southern kingdom. This conclusion he supposes to be pretty certain from a comparison of ix. 11 with v. 40, etc. The comparison does not necessarily warrant it. Bertheau remarks in opposition, that various notices in the preceding chapters carry the history beyond the exile, as iii. 10-24 and perhaps iv. 1-23. It is difficult to see why the eighth and ninth chapters should be in their present place, if they belonged to the pre-exile period. Why should there be a double genealogy of Benjamin, both parts relating to the pre-exile time (vii. 6-9 and viii.)? And why should the sons of Judah (iv.) be so far separated from the account of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (ix.)? Another view is that of Lavater, J. H. Michaelis, Dahler, Herzfeld, etc., who think that the accounts in viii. belong to the fore-exile time, and those in ix. to the inhabitants of Jerusalem after the exile. This is the correct view; for in ix. 2 there is a transition from one period to another; the first verse being the conclusion of the chronicle-writer respecting the fore-exile time. The double genealogy of Benjamin in the same period, which Bertheau¹ adduces, argues nothing in favour of chaps. viii. and ix. belonging to the same period, because it appears that the seventh chapter was inserted by the Chronist pretty nearly as he found it. But as it consisted merely of six verses, he thought it too short, especially since the tribe called for a more copious description in consequence of its connexion with Judah and Levi, as well as king Saul. Hence he gave another list in the eighth chapter, derived from a register constructed after *the principal cities* in the territory of Benjamin. And as Gibeon is named last, it formed an appropriate point of attachment for the genealogy of Saul, which is continued down to the fourteenth generation. The list given in chap. vii. was a military one.

The ninth chapter gives the heads of the people inhabiting Jerusalem after the Babylonian conquest. Its statements chiefly relate to members of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, as well as to the priests, Levites, their employments, and to the porters.

¹ Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. i. p. 240.

² Die Bücher der Chronik, p. 88.

As introductory to David's history we are presented with brief notices of Saul's race, and the downfall of his house. Here the list given by the compiler extends to the words "two hundred and twelve" in the twenty-second verse; the remainder till verse thirty-three inclusive, being an appendix from his own pen relating to the worship of God and its regulations. Verses ix. 34-44 are a repetition of viii. 29-39, except that they are less by two names, stopping with the sons of Azel. Such repetition shews an inartificial but not careless compilation; for the object in this case was to connect the beginning of the history of royalty with the preceding genealogical registers, which could only be done by referring back to them. It is true that it was not necessary to give the same statement again; but the Chronicle-writer evinces great partiality for genealogies. The word לל in the thirty-fourth verse creates great difficulty, but may be best explained by supposing it to have been inserted by some later scribes, who, overlooking the true connexion, thought from the closing words of verse thirty-four, "these dwelt at Jerusalem," that the list from verse three onwards, where similar words occur, reached as far as the thirty-fourth verse. The account of Saul's last battle, his death and burial, (x. 1-12,) is very nearly identical with 1 Sam. xxxi. 1-13). The thirteenth and fourteenth verses are the remarks of the Chronist, shewing that the narrative of Saul's death is merely introductory to David's history.

The eleventh chapter describes David's inauguration at Hebron as king over all Israel, and his conquest of Jerusalem (xi. 1-9), with a list of his mighty men and brief notices of their exploits (10-47). There is a substantial agreement between the contents of the chapter and 2 Samuel v. 6-10; xxiii. 8-39. The list of names in 26-47 amounts to forty-eight, while that in 2 Sam. xxiii. amounts only to thirty-two.

The twelfth chapter presents three lists of David's followers, viz., those who attached themselves to him during Saul's life (1-7), when he was in Ziklag; those belonging to the tribe of Gad and others of Judah and Benjamin, who joined him when he was in his mountain fastnesses (8-18); and a list of seven men of the tribe of Manasseh who joined his standard when he came with the Philistines against Saul to battle (19-22). This is followed by an enumeration of the troops who assembled at Hebron to solemnise David's accession to the kingdom of all Israel (23-40). On this occasion upwards of 300,000 armed men are said to have been present.

The thirteenth chapter describes how the ark of the covenant was brought into the house of Obed-edom, where it continued

for three months. With the exception of the first five verses relating to David's consultation with the leaders of the people before removing the ark, the contents are nearly the same, word for word, in Chronicles and Samuel.

The fourteenth chapter describes how David built a palace for himself, the increase of his family at Jerusalem, and two victories over the Philistines in the valley of Rephaim.

The fifteenth and sixteenth chapters are properly a continuation of the thirteenth; the fourteenth being inserted. They commence with the preparations which David made for the removal of the ark to Jerusalem. He built a tent for it, and gathered all Israel together to the ceremony, the Levites alone being appointed to carry and take charge of it. Its entrance into the city was commemorated with music and dancing, followed by burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, and a present to every individual. The king appointed certain of the Levites to minister before the ark and praise the Lord God. He also delivered a psalm into the hand of Asaph and his brethren, to be used in the installation-service. After the psalm itself is given, the narrative goes back to the point where it broke off at the fourth, fifth, and sixth verses of xvi. for the purpose of continuing the list of the Levites who ministered before the ark (vers. 37-43). The notices in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters are much more copious than the corresponding section in 2 Sam. vi. 11-19. From xvi. 25 to xvii. 3 the narratives are almost identical in words.

In the seventeenth chapter David proposes to build a temple; but as Nathan disallows it, he thankfully acknowledges the promise respecting the execution of the work by Solomon. This is followed, in the eighteenth chapter, by accounts of his wars against the Philistines, Moabites, Syrians, and Edomites, with a list of the principal officers who assisted him in the government.

The nineteenth chapter narrates the occasion and occurrences of the successful war engaged in by David against the allied forces of Ammon and Syria, which ended in their defeat, and the destruction of Rabbah, the Ammonitish capital, by Joab (xix. 1-xx. 3). After a brief mention of several Philistine wars, and the distinction obtained in them by some of his champions (xx. 4-8), the history proceeds to David's numbering of the people, the pestilence which followed as a punishment, and his selection of Ornan's threshing-floor as the site of a future temple. It is related that David himself sacrificed both during and after the pestilence at the threshing-floor. He could not offer his holocaust in Jerusalem, because the tabernacle and with it the altar of burnt-offering were then in the high place at Gibeon;

nor could he go to Gibeon to inquire of the Lord, for he was afraid of the sword of the angel of God (ch. xxi.).

Forbidden himself to build the temple, David prepared materials in abundance (xxii. 1-5). Shortly before his death, he called his son Solomon and charged him to build it; telling him that though he wished to do it himself he was prevented, because he was a man of war and blood. He exhorted his son to keep the law, and acquainted him with the preparations made for the building. He also charged the princes of Israel to help Solomon with all their might, since the Lord had given them rest on every side (xxii. 6-19).

The twenty-third chapter tells us how David made Solomon king, reckoned the Levites above thirty years of age, and fixed the number for the different employments—viz., 24,000 to promote the work of the house of Jehovah; 6,000 to be writers and judges; 4,000 to be porters, and 4,000 musicians (2-5). The twenty-four house-fathers of the Levites are given according to their descent from the three sons of Levi respectively (6-23). This is followed by a few remarks as an appendix, among which it is said that David made a census of the Levites from twenty years old and above (24-32).

The twenty-fourth chapter describes how the priests were distributed into twenty-four classes under as many heads; sixteen of these presidents being descended from Eleazar, and eight from Ithamar. It is said, that each series of house-fathers or officers, the sixteen of Eleazar and the eight of Ithamar, was to be determined by lot (xxiv. 1-19). The names of several Levites are then given, who seem to have presided over classes of their brethren; but the list is manifestly imperfect (20-31).

The musicians and choristers were distributed into twenty-four classes of twelve persons each. Each class consisted of sons and brothers of its leader, who was himself a son of Asaph Heman or Jeduthun, to whom was assigned the direction of the whole (xxv. 1-31).

The twenty-sixth chapter describes the classes of porters, who were all Korhites or Merarites. Ninety-three heads of these porters are given, i.e., the sons and brothers of Hosah, thirteen; Obed-edom, sixty-two; Meshelemiah, eighteen; the entire number being four thousand. The allotment of their different positions is obscure to us at the present day (xxvi. 1-19). The keepers of the treasures of the sanctuary are next mentioned (xxvi. 20-28); followed by those who presided over "the outward business," or services external to the temple; among whom were the writers and judges (29-32). The thirty-first and thirty-second verses are very obscure, because the former

appears to have a parenthetical sentence which separates "Jerijah the chief" from "and his brethren, men of valour," etc.

The twenty-seventh chapter commences with an account of the twelve divisions of the army, each consisting of 24,000 men, whose leaders were designed to be attendants on the royal person each for a month (xxvii. 1-15). A list of the princes of the twelve tribes is given (16-24); but Gad and Asher are omitted. The chapter closes with an account of the officers who had charge of the possessions of David, which are particularly enumerated as consisting of those kept in Jerusalem, those kept in granaries elsewhere, farms, vineyards, olive and sycamore orchards, oxen, camels, asses, sheep (25-31). A short list of other officers is subjoined (32-34)

In the twenty-eighth chapter it is related that the king assembled at Jerusalem all the princes of Israel, both military and civil, to hear his last charge to them. He told them how he had proposed to build a temple for Jehovah; but had been divinely informed that it was not for such a man of war and bloodshed to execute his design; the honour being reserved for his son Solomon, to whom Jehovah had assured him He would be a father and establish his kingdom for ever, if he would be constant to keep His commandments and statutes. After exhorting the assembled people to observe all the laws of God, he addressed Solomon in solemn language, and gave him the plans of the sacred building communicated to himself by Jehovah, patterns of his arrangements of the services devolving upon the priests and Levites, and the immense quantities of silver and gold which he had collected, divided in portions adapted to their several uses.

In the twenty-ninth chapter David makes an appeal to the congregation thus assembled to exercise a suitable liberality towards the building of the temple, in proportion to what he had himself done (1-5). The princes follow his example, responding to the appeal most liberally (6-9). Then the king thanks God for the readiness with which the people presented the gifts they had received from the Almighty, accompanying his words with expressions of a sense of his own unworthiness (10-19). The solemnity closes with a united prostration of the whole assembly and a succession of sacrifices and festivities; at which Solomon is again recognised king (20-25). The part concludes with a brief notice of the length of David's reign, of his dying in a good old age, full of days, riches, and honour; referring the reader for a full account of his acts to a certain book or books in which they were recorded (26-30).

The second part or book of Chronicles begins with an account

of Solomon's solemn journey to Gibeon, where he offers a thousand burnt-offerings on the great altar, and God appears to him the night after in a dream, offering him whatever he should ask. He requests wisdom and knowledge to fit him for governing so great a people, which are bestowed together with unprecedented riches and honour. Returning to Jerusalem from before the tabernacle of the congregation, he reigned over Israel (2 Chron. i. 1-13). This is followed by an account of his chariots, horsemen, and riches (14-17). The narrative proceeds at once to the preparations for building the temple. Solomon wrote to Hiram, king of Tyre, to propose the purchase of timber of various kinds, and the hire of a man skilful in the metals, as well as in purple, crimson, and blue. Hiram accepts the proposal. A Tyrian is sent as the principal artificer; and it is promised that the timber should be delivered in floats at Joppa (i. 18-ii. 18). The third chapter proceeds to describe the place and time of building, the measure and ornaments of the house, the cherubim, the vail, and the two pillars. The fourth chapter speaks of the brazen altar, the molten sea supported by twelve oxen, the ten golden candlesticks, the ten tables, and the hundred golden basons (1-8). After this the narrative mentions the court of the priests or inner court, the great court, the doors of the court, the place where the brazen sea stood, a list of the brazen instruments made by Hiram, and the golden instruments which Solomon made (9-22). The account of the making of the sacred vessels closes with v. 1. From chaps. v. 2 till vii. 10, relates to the dedication of the temple. The ark is carried by the Levites into the holy of holies and the temple is filled with the glory of the Lord (2-14). Solomon addresses the congregation of Israel (vi. 1-11), and prays to God (12-42). After the prayer, fire comes down from heaven and consumes the sacrifices. The priests could not enter because of the glory of the Lord. On witnessing this phenomenon the congregation bowed themselves to the ground and praised Jehovah (vii. 1-3). Then the king and all the people offered sacrifices, kept the feast of tabernacles immediately succeeding the dedication of the temple, for seven days, held a solemn assembly on the eighth day (*i.e.*, the twenty-second day of the seventh month) and dismissed the people on the next day (vii. 4-10). God now appeared to Solomon, and gave him an answer to the prayer uttered at the dedication of the temple (vii. 11-22). The eighth chapter has an account of Solomon's other buildings. He peopled the cities given him by Hiram with Israelites; built a number of others; made tributaries of the remains of the Canaanite races in the land; and removed Pharaoh's daughter into the palace he had built for her (1-11). The narrative then

records that the king offered sacrifices on the altar he had built; and appointed priests and Levites to their proper places. An expedition to Ophir is appended (12-18). The first twelve verses of the ninth chapter describe the visit of the queen of Sheba to Solomon, with her admiration of his wisdom and princely state. His great revenues, commerce, military power, magnificence, extent of empire and wealth are briefly noticed (ix. 1-28); and his biography terminates with the length of his reign, his burial, and successor (ix. 22-31).

The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth chapters relate to the reign of Rehoboam. The tenth chapter states how when the Israelites were assembled at Shechem to crown Rehoboam, Jeroboam and the others begged some relaxation of the heavy burdens they had been suffering; how he refused to follow the elders' advice and gave a rough answer; on which ten tribes revolted and caused him to flee to Jerusalem (x. 1-19). In the eleventh chapter we read that, in obedience to the will of God expressed through Shemaiah the prophet, Rehoboam and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin desisted from their intended attack upon the northern tribes (1-4); that he took various measures for strengthening his kingdom by building fenced cities and forts; and that Judah acquired power in consequence of the priests and Levites driven from the northern kingdom coming to the southern one, followed by the true worshippers of Jehovah from among all the tribes (5-17). Some accounts of the royal family close the chapter. But Rehoboam was infatuated with prosperity, and forsook the law of the Lord. Accordingly he was punished by the invasion of a hostile force. Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem and plundered it, which is represented as a mitigated infliction in consequence of the repentance of the king and nobles on the representation of Shemaiah (xii. 1-12). The duration of Rehoboam's reign with his mother's name are given; and judgment is pronounced upon his character (13-16). The thirteenth chapter relates to Abijah, who made war against Jeroboam. Standing upon mount Zemaraim, he proclaimed to Jeroboam and his people that they had rebelled against the proper representative of David and had worshipped golden calves as gods and banished the priests and Levites; but extolled the fidelity of his own adherents, the purity of their worship, and their attachment to Jehovah. Trusting in God though surprised by an ambuscade they shouted, and smote Jeroboam's host (1-20). The chapter concludes with the mention of Abijah's wives, children, and death (21-23). The history of Abijah in Kings is very short.

Asa, a pious king, removed the altars of the strange gods, and endeavoured to root out idolatry from the kingdom. He

took advantage of a time of peace to erect fortifications and equip an army of 580,000 men. In a war with Zerah the Ethiopian, who had invaded Judah with an immense host, he obtained a decisive victory, and got much spoil (xiv. 1-15). Moved by the prophecy of Azariah the son of Oded, he put away the idols out of Judah and Benjamin as well as from the cities he had taken from Ephraim, and renewed the altar of the Lord that was before the porch, *i.e.*, the altar of burnt-offering. In a solemn assembly in the third month of the fifteenth year of his reign, all Judah and Benjamin, with the strangers belonging to other Israelite tribes, made a solemn covenant, binding themselves to be loyal to Jehovah (xv. 1-15). He removed his mother from being queen for her idolatry, and brought into the house of God the things his father had dedicated (xv. 16-18). When Baasha king of Israel invaded Judah, he proposed an alliance with the king of Syria who sent his captains against Israel and diverted Baasha from building Ramah (xvi. 1-6). Being reprov'd for his reliance on Syria instead of Jehovah by Hanani the prophet, he put the latter in prison (7-10). The chapter closes with mention of a disease he had, during which he trusted in physicians rather than God, and of his death and burial (11-14).

The seventeenth commences with an account of Jehoshaphat's carefulness for the security of his kingdom, his receiving a large revenue in presents, his removal of idolatrous places, and his provision for the religious instruction of the people by an itinerant embassy of five princes, nine Levites, and two priests. He escaped all wars with the neighbouring nations, and even received from some of them submission and tribute. The chapter closes with a list of the principal commanders of his reign (xvii. 1-19). It is then related that he visited Ahab king of Israel at Samaria, who asked him to go up with him against Ramoth-gilead. They joined forces and attacked the place. Ahab was slain, as Micaiah had foretold (xviii. 1-34).

The nineteenth chapter begins with narrating the judgment pronounced by Jehu on the alliance of Jehoshaphat with Ahab, which had proved so disastrous; in consequence of which he began to reform the administration of his kingdom. He set judges in the land throughout all the fenced cities of Judah, gave them suitable directions, and established in Jerusalem a supreme tribunal of the Levites and priests and the chief of the fathers, with separate presiding officers (xix. 1-11). The eastern peoples had already invaded the country before the king had heard of it, on which he immediately proclaimed a fast throughout all Judah. Before the new court in the temple he offered up a solemn prayer for guidance and help (xx. 1-13). It is then

said that the Spirit of the Lord came upon Jahaziel, a Levite, who told them where the enemy was encamped, and bade them march thither on the morrow. They would not need to fight, but to stand still and see the salvation of the Lord. On hearing this, the king and all the people worshipped Jehovah; the Levites praising Him with a loud voice. On the morrow, the Moabites and Ammonites fell together upon the inhabitants of mount Seir to destroy them, and having effected their purpose destroyed one another. Accordingly when Judah came to a mountainous place whence they could look over the wilderness of Jeruel, nothing but dead bodies was to be seen, for none escaped. The Jews were three days in gathering the vast spoil on the battle field; after which, having kept a day of thanksgiving at Berachah, they returned home in triumph (xx. 14-30). The account of the close of Jehoshaphat's history (xx. 31-34; xxi. 1) is separated by a statement respecting his joining Ahaziah king of Israel to make ships in Ezion-gaber for sailing to Tarshish; an expedition that proved disastrous (xx. 35-37). Jehoram, eldest son of Jehoshaphat, who succeeded his father in the kingdom, murdered six brothers whom their father had generously provided for, together with several of the principal men in the kingdom, and acted wickedly in other respects. The Edomites and people of Libnah revolted. In consequence of his erecting idolatrous places on the mountains of Judah and leading the people into gross sins, the prophet Elijah sent him a letter of reproof, predicting for him a fatal malady. Because of his wickedness, therefore, the Philistines and Arabians came upon him, took all that was in his palace, carried off his wives and children, leaving him but one son; after which he was smitten with an incurable disease, and he died at the end of two years (xxi. 2-20). Jehoram was succeeded by his son Ahaziah, who did evil in the sight of the Lord under the influence of his idolatrous mother and her family. He went to war with the Syrians in union with Jehoram son of Ahab, and being wounded, went to see his cousin at Jezreel. When Jehu was executing judgment upon the house of Ahab, it is said that he slew the princes of Judah and the sons of the brethren of Ahaziah; and Ahaziah himself was dragged from a hiding-place in Samaria, brought into the presence of Jehu, and there put to death (xxii. 1-9). After his death Athaliah, his mother, aiming at the sovereignty for herself, slew all the seed royal except Joash, whom his aunt hid in the temple six years; Athaliah in the meantime reigning over the land (xxii. 10-12).

The twenty-third chapter begins with relating how Jehoiada took successful measures for making Joash king (1-11). Athaliah coming into the temple was taken out and slain (12-15).

Jehoiada engaged both king and people to be true to Jehovah; on which the altars and images of Baal were destroyed, and the worship of God restored according to the law. Joash was then led in solemn procession from the temple into the palace, and the city was quiet (16-21). Of the young king it is said that he reigned well as long as Jehoiada lived, repaired the temple, made vessels for it, and thus put to rights what had been broken up by Athaliah's sons (xxiv. 1-14). After recording Jehoiada's death, we are told that the weak king listened to his courtiers, and fell into idolatry. The people would not hear the prophets sent to reclaim them; and when Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, boldly reprov'd them, he was stoned by the king's commandment (15-22). The punishments announced by Zechariah were not long delayed, for the Syrians came and spoiled Jerusalem. After their departure Joash's own servants conspired against and slew him (23-27).

The twenty-fifth chapter refers to the reign of Amaziah, who executed justice on the traitors that had killed his father Joash. He mustered an army of 300,000 choice men, and also hired 100,000 out of Israel; but when a prophet remonstrated with him on this latter arrangement, he sent the Israelitish soldiers home, thus forfeiting his money. At this they were greatly displeased, and vented their indignation as they went home by falling upon all the cities of Judah that lay in their way and smiting the inhabitants. After Amaziah had overthrown the Edomites, he introduced their gods into his kingdom; and when a prophet reprov'd him for this, he answered roughly, on which the man of God forbore, declaring that God had determined to destroy the king for his idolatry (xxv. 1-16). Having provoked Joash king of Israel to battle, he was taken captive and brought to Jerusalem. After plundering the temple and palace, Joash returned with the spoil to Samaria. When a conspiracy was made against Amaziah he fled to Lachish, but was slain there, and his body transported to Jerusalem to be buried with his fathers (xxv. 17-28). The next king of Judah, Uzziah, did what was right in the sight of Jehovah, as long as Zechariah lived; who, as a distinguished prophet, must have been his counsellor (xxvi. 1-5). The narrative proceeds to relate his successful wars against the Philistines, Arabians, and Me hunims; his receiving tribute from the Ammonites; his buildings and fortifications; his digging of wells; his interest in herds, vineyards, and husbandry; his great military force, well armed and marshalled; his engines made to shoot arrows and great stones (6-15). But prosperity made him proud, and he invaded the priest's office by going into the temple and burning incense. When Azariah and eighty priests withstood him, the king

became angry; and while he yet had a censer in his hand, the leprosy appeared in his forehead. The disgusted priests seeing this thrust him out, though he hastened of himself to withdraw. He continued a leper and lived in a house apart, till the day of his death (xxvi. 6-23).

The twenty-seventh chapter relates to the reign of Jotham, Uzziah's son, which was a prosperous one, because he did what was right in the sight of the Lord. He built the high or upper (northern) gate of the temple; fortified the wall of Ophel; erected castles and towers on the heights belonging to Judah; and carried on a successful war against the Ammonites, whom he compelled to pay tribute for three years (xxvii. 1-9).

The twenty-eighth chapter treats of Ahaz son of Jotham. His idolatrous practices are described, on account of which he was unsuccessful in war with the Syrians, who smote him and carried away great numbers of prisoners. In like manner Pekah king of Israel, aided by the personal prowess of one Zichri, slew 120,000 in one day, and carried off captive 200,000 women, sons, and daughters, with great spoil to Samaria. A prophet named Oded met the Israelites as they returned home, and told them that they should liberate the captives and restore the spoil. This advice was supported by certain leading Ephraimites, in consequence of which both prisoners and spoil were left by the soldiers, so that the men named took and brought them back as far as Jericho (1-15). Though Ahaz sent for aid to Assyria against the inroads of the Edomites and Philistines, he was not really helped by it, because the alliance was oppressive and costly. In his distress he did not turn to the Lord, but introduced the worship of the Syrian gods to his ruin, destroyed the holy vessels of the temple in his infatuation, and filled the city with heathen altars. After death he was not buried in the place of royal sepulture (16-27).

The twenty-ninth chapter records the accession of Hezekiah, who began his reign with opening and repairing the doors of the temple, and exhorting the priests and Levites to sanctify themselves and cleanse the house of the Lord. Hence they set about the work with vigour; removed the rubbish that had collected within the sacred building, and put the furniture in order. When all was ready, the king set about the re-dedication of the temple, and the restoration of its worship in an imposing form. In the presence of the rulers of the city, he offered a great sacrifice of bullocks, rams, lambs, and he-goats, as a sin-offering for Judah. When the burnt-offering began, the praises of Jehovah commenced with the trumpets and instruments appointed by David. At the end of this offering, the king and all present bowed themselves and worshipped (1-29)

It is then said that into the newly-dedicated temple the congregation, at the king's command, brought numerous thank-offerings and burnt-offerings, so that the priests were too few; and their brethren the Levites, who were more zealous than the priests, helped them till the work was finished (30-36).

The next thing proposed by Hezekiah was the celebration of the passover. The king and his princes sent letters throughout all Israel and Judah, inviting the people to come to Jerusalem to attend the ceremony. In his own kingdom of Judah, the proposal was joyfully received; among the northern tribes, it was for the most part treated with derision. The assembly, having first destroyed the idolatrous altars which had been erected by Ahaz, proceeded to keep the feast. But so imperfect was the celebration, that the priests and Levites were ashamed; for they were killing the passover on the fourteenth day of the second month instead of the first; many in the congregation were not sanctified; and many of the tribes of Ephraim, Manasseh, Issachar, and Zebulun had not purified themselves. Hezekiah offered a prayer for forgiveness; and God healed the people of the sickness inflicted on them for their irregularity. Seven days the feast was kept with great gladness, the priests and Levites daily praising Jehovah with instruments; and they resolved to keep other seven days. After Hezekiah and the princes gave the congregation rich presents of bullocks and sheep for sacrificial feasting, they determined to remain together seven days longer and rejoice (xxx. 1-27). In consequence of this solemnity, the zeal of the people shewed itself in destroying the high places and images of idolatry, both in the southern and northern kingdoms (xxx. 1). The king reappointed the courses of the priests and Levites, and settled what proportions of the contributions for the public sacrifices and for the maintenance of the priests and Levites were to be furnished by himself and by the people of Jerusalem. A liberal contribution of offerings and tithes was made for four months, and the amassed stores were laid up in chambers belonging to the temple, in the custody of suitable overseers; while others were appointed to distribute their proper portions to the priests and Levites and their families at Jerusalem, and in the Levitical cities (xxx. 2-21).

The thirty-second chapter refers to Sennacherib's invasion of Judah. Measures were taken against the enemy by Hezekiah and his nobles, in cutting off the supplies of water, repairing the walls and towers of the city, arming and encouraging the garrison (1-8). While Sennacherib remained at Lachish and all his army with him, he sent a blasphemous message and letters, for which cause Hezekiah and Isaiah cried to heaven.

The Lord sent an angel who cut off all the mighty men of the Assyrians and saved Jerusalem. Sennacherib on his return was assassinated by his own sons (9-23). After this Hezekiah became sick, and prayed to God, who gave him a sign of recovery. But he became proud, was punished, and humbled himself. The chapter concludes with a brief description of his wealth and honour, his buildings, prosperity and death (24-33).

The thirty-third chapter commences with the reign of Manasseh, Hezekiah's son. He did what was evil in the sight of the Lord, set up idolatry in the kingdom, and would not hearken to the divine admonitions of the prophets (1-10). For this he was punished by the Assyrians, who carried him away captive to Babylon, where however he repented, and was restored to his throne (11-13). After his return he improved the fortifications of the metropolis, put captains of war in all the fenced cities of Judah, removed from the temple and from Jerusalem the statues and altars of false gods, repaired the altar of Jehovah and sacrificed on it (14-17). With a brief recapitulation of these events of his reign and his death, the record closes (18-20). The reign of his son Amon is very summarily described. He lived wickedly, encouraged idolatry, and was slain by his own servants. His son Josiah succeeded him (21-25).

The thirteenth chapter relates to the reign of Josiah, who began early to seek after God, and to signalise his pious zeal by rooting out idolatry from Judah and Jerusalem. His measures of reform were even carried into the cities of Manasseh, Ephraim, Simeon, as far as Naphtali (1-7). After this he gave orders respecting the repair of the temple; and in the preliminary steps taken to carry them into effect, Hilkiah discovered the book of the law in the temple, which was read to the king by Shaphan. The king therefore sent a message to Huldah the prophetess, who foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, but not in the days of Josiah himself (8-28). He caused the book to be read in a solemn assembly, at which the covenant of obedience to Jehovah by himself and his people was renewed (29-32).

The thirty-fifth chapter describes that memorable passover in Jerusalem which was kept in the eighteenth year of Josiah. The king and his princes, with nine persons, three of them rulers of the house of God, and six, chiefs of the Levites, gave very liberal presents to the people, priests and Levites (1-19). When Necho king of Egypt afterwards came up to fight at Carchemish with the Medes and Babylonians, in company with the king of Assyria, Josiah went out against him, and would not be dissuaded by an embassy from such alliance. Though he

took the field in disguise he was mortally wounded by an arrow ; and having been removed out of his war-chariot into another, was conveyed to Jerusalem where he died greatly lamented (20-27).

The short reign of Jehoahaz, son of Josiah, is briefly described. The king of Egypt removed him from the throne, put the land under tribute, and made Eliakim his brother king in his stead, changing his name to Jehoiakim (xxxvi. 1-4). Jehoiakim reigned badly ; the king of Babylon came up against him, bound him in fetters, and carried him away. Nebuchadnezzar also took away the vessels out of the temple, to his temple at Babylon (5-8). He was succeeded by Jehoiachin his son, who was also transported to Babylon with the vessels of the temple ; Nebuchadnezzar making Zedekiah his brother, or rather uncle, king over Judah and Jerusalem (9, 10). *He also acted wickedly, disobeyed Jeremiah the prophet, and rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar.* The chief of the priests and the people also acted idolatrously and polluted the house of God. They would not listen to the divine admonitions of the prophets, but provoked the Most High. In consequence of the national sins, Jerusalem was wholly destroyed by the Chaldeans (11-21). The book closes with a short reference to the proclamation of Cyrus (22, 23).

III. SOURCES.—The following documents are referred to by the compiler himself.

1. The book of Samuel the seer, and the book of Nathan the prophet, and the book of Gad the seer (1 Chron. xxix. 29), for the history of David.

2. The book of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the visions of Iddo the seer against Jeroboam the son of Nebat (2 Chron. ix. 29), for the history of Solomon.

3. The book of Shemaiah the prophet and of Iddo the seer (2 Chron. xii. 15), for the history of Rehoboam.

4. The book of Jehu the son of Hanani transferred into the book of the kings of Israel (2 Chron. xx. 34), for the history of Jehoshaphat.

5. The story (Midrash) of the book of the kings (2 Chron. xxiv. 27), for the history of Joash.

6. A work of Isaiah the prophet respecting Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi. 22).

7. The vision of Isaiah the prophet (2 Chron. xxxii. 32), for the history of Hezekiah.

8. The book of the kings of Israel (2 Chron. xxxiii. 18), for the history of Manasseh.

9. The sayings of the seers (Hosai) in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19, for the history of Manasseh.

10. The book of the kings of Judah and Israel (2 Chron. xvi. 11; xxv. 26; xxviii. 26), for the histories of Asa, Amaziah, and Ahaz.

11. The book of the kings of Israel and Judah (2 Chron. xxvii. 7; xxxv. 27; xxxvi. 8), for the histories of Jotham, Josiah, and Jehoiakim.

12. The story (Midrash) of the prophet Iddo (2 Chron. xiii. 22), for the history of Abijah.

In relation to Nos. 4, 8, 10, 11 (the book of the kings of Israel) it is observable that all relate to one and the same document. A large work is quoted or referred to under these different names. It consisted of two leading divisions, the one relating to the kings of Judah, the other to those of Israel, each of which is quoted *singly* in the book of Kings, either as *the book of the kings of Judah*, or *the book of the kings of Israel*. In the Chronicles both are appealed to as a whole. As to No. 5, Keil thinks¹ that it refers to the same *book of the kings of Judah and Israel*, because the history of Joash for which the Chronicles refer to the *Midrash of the book of the kings* (No. 5) agrees as much with 2 Kings xi. and xii. as the history of those kings where the Chronicles appeal to the book of the kings of Judah and Israel, and the books of Kings to the chronicles of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, harmonises in the two canonical works. This is plausible. Bleek's opinion coincides with it. The expression *מִדְרָשׁ סֵפֶר* may be taken as equivalent to the simple *סֵפֶר*, as it is on the supposition of the assumed identity of No. 5 and 10, 11, 8, 4. Thenius and Bertheau, however, understand *מִדְרָשׁ* to mean *an explanation*; in which case the sense of No. 5 will be, *an explanatory document*, which the compiler of Chronicles occasionally employed. The word *Midrash* is however obscure, and Ewald takes it in 2 Chron. xiii. 22, the only other place where it occurs in the Old Testament, in the sense of *essay, writing*.² Why it should be here prefixed to *סֵפֶר* on the assumption that both are tantamount to *סֵפֶר* it is hard to conceive, unless it were designedly used to denote something else, especially as it is a rare word. Others have conjectured that the book of Kings in the title refers to *the canonical kings*; and that the production so called proceeded from a writer after the canonical work of Kings was known and circulated, who, feeling its unsatisfactory nature in part, collected together various things belonging to the kingly period into a document which he called *Midrash sepher Melachim*. This is doubtful.

In relation to 1, 2, 3, 4 (the book of Jehu the son of Hanani),

¹ *Einleitung*, p. 436, second edition.

² *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. i. p. 296.

6, 7, 9, 12, the question is whether they were distinct documents, or sections of the work designated as *the book of the kings of Israel and Judah*. That they were prophetic productions is obvious, and that the latter was historical is also clear. Hence their distinctness of character might appear to lead to the conclusion that they were independent documents. But it does not necessarily follow that they were separate. It is expressly said of No. 4, that it had been taken into the book of the kings of Israel; and of No. 7, that it was in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel. Thus two at least of the prophetic writings belonged to the large historical work. What then is to be said of the remaining ones? The fact of their not being noted in the way of these two seems to indicate their independent nature. In No. 9 we take the word *רְחוּם* not as the plural meaning *seers*, which was perhaps at first *רְחוּם* *the seers*, but as a proper name. If the word *לְהַתְּיָחַשׁ* in No. 3 means *belonging to the genealogical list*, and so refers to the place where the words of Shemaiah and Iddo were to be found, the opinion respecting the prophetic monographs that they formed a part of the large historical work would be corroborated. But it is very difficult to tell what it signifies. Our translators seem to have come as near its signification as any critic who has since attempted to explain it. Bertheau¹ conjectures that in the history of Rehoboam contained in the book of Kings there were copious accounts of the race of David; and that the section in which particulars respecting Rehoboam and the prophets Shemaiah and Iddo stood, began with a genealogical list. This is more than doubtful. The manner in which the document is referred to appears to us to shew that it was not incorporated into the large historical composition; for in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18, *the book of the kings of Israel* is referred to for the history of Manassch; whereas for the same king, *the sayings of the seers* (No. 9) are appealed to in the next verse. Surely therefore Nos. 8 and 9 were not identical, nor was the latter a part of the former. In No. 6 the citation is peculiar: "The rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, write" (2 Chron. xxvi. 22). One is inclined to believe that the monograph of Isaiah was single and independent, especially as it is not found either in Isaiah's prophecies in the canon, or in the historical appendix Is. xxxvi.-xxxix. No. 12, viz., a Midrash of the prophet Iddo, seems to have contained an explanation of a section of the large work termed *the prophet Iddo*.

On the whole it is more probable that the prophetic docu-

¹ Die Bücher der Chronik, Einleitung, p. 1

ments alluded to in Nos. 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, existed as separate monographs, than that they were incorporated with the large historical work, *the books of the kings of Israel and Judah*, which grew to its full dimensions—and these must have been considerable—out of memoranda committed to writing in different reigns, memoranda relating to public affairs. Records of contemporaries or of persons who lived soon after the occurrences described, contributed to make up the body of the work. The prophets themselves wrote some things. Doubtless also the official annals of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel were used. Indeed the latter formed the basis or groundwork of the document. It contained a history of Israel from David to Jehoiakim for the southern kingdom; and that of the northern kingdom to its close.

In speaking of Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, as prophetic documents, it is implied that they were written by prophets. Thus when reference is made for a more copious account of David's acts to "the book of Samuel the seer, and the book of Nathan the prophet, and the book of Gad the seer" (No. 1), we must suppose that these prophets wrote separate but incomplete accounts of David's life. In like manner, when for the whole history of Solomon are cited the book of Nathan the prophet, the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and the visions of Iddo the seer respecting Rehoboam (No. 2), various monographs are meant which were written by Nathan, Ahijah, and Iddo. In the same way the other Nos. should be understood. But Bertheau denies that the productions referred to were written by prophets, thinking them certain sections in the large historical work which, while relating to the times of individual kings, described the actions and influence of the prophets in question. He is obliged to except No. 6. He mentions, however, as corroborative of his own hypothesis one fact, viz., the uniformity of the discourses attributed to the prophets in the Chronicles; shewing, in his opinion, that they did not themselves commit to writing the principal transactions of their lives, or at least, if they did, the accounts have not their original form in the Chronicles. Judging from the way in which the Chronicle-writer employs his sources elsewhere, it is improbable that he elaborated the addresses of the prophets into their present form. They must have had their shape in the documents employed by him; and if such be the case, the great likeness between them is adverse to the view of their proceeding from the prophets themselves (comp. 2 Chron. xii. 5, 7, etc.; xv. 2-7; xx. 15-17; xxiv. 20, 22; xxv. 15, etc.; xxviii. 9, 11; xxxiv. 24-26). Such is the reasoning of Bertheau,¹ which, however, does not affect our

¹ Die Bücher der Chronik, Einleit. pp. xxxix. xl.

view, because we do not suppose that the prophets recorded *their own discourses* in the monographs referred to. They wrote events in the lives of kings, rather than their own biographies. And there is nothing against the view, that the form of the prophetic discourses was altered in the progress of time.

We suppose that the compiler of Kings and the author of Chronicles used the same work, each taking from it according to his own plan. This is confirmed by the relation between numerous sections in the Chronicles and Kings, which agree almost verbatim. Thenius indeed argues from the difference of names, *the book of the chronicles* *הַיְמִינִי הַקִּבְרִי* (quoted in Kings) and the book of the kings of Judah and Israel (quoted in Chronicles) that they were not identical. But no weight attaches to the mere appellation; and it is observable, that the compiler of Kings refers to the book of the *chronicles of the kings of Judah* in places corresponding to those in Chronicles where allusion is made to prophetic sections belonging to *the book of the kings of Judah and Israel*. We arrange the sources thus.

A common source.

The book of the kings of Judah and Israel (Chronicles); or,
the book of the chronicles of Judah (Kings).

The book of Kings.

The book of Chronicles.

In addition to the sources described, the compiler must have had others. Thus the lists of David's heroes (xi. 10-47), of those who came to him at Ziklag (xii. 1-22); of the captains, princes of the tribes, and officers of David's household (xxvii.), the number and distribution of the Levites, and the minute information given respecting divine worship (xxiii.-xxvi.) must have been derived from written sources not included in the oft-quoted *book of the kings of Israel and Judah*. From the words of 1 Chron. xxvii. 24, "Joab began to number but he finished not, because there fell wrath for it against Israel; neither was the number put in the account of the *chronicles of king David*," it would appear that the lists given in xxiii.-xxvii. were taken from these *chronicles* or *journals*. Nothing is known farther about the nature of this document; though Dr. Lee finds more of it in 1 Chron. xxiii. 27, "by the last words of David the Levites were numbered from twenty years old and above," compared with xxiv. 6, "Shemaiah the son of Nethaneel the scribe, one of the Levites, wrote them before the king and the princes," etc.¹ But that critic is totally in error in thinking that Shemaiah was the author of the document referred to as *the chronicles of David*. It is simply

¹ The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, etc. Appendix D. p. 411, ed. New York, 1867.

meant that Shemaiah wrote the names for the purpose of the lot.

Some documents are *mentioned* by the compiler which he did not *use* as sources. Thus a writing of Elijah addressed to Jehoram is spoken of in 2 Chron. xxi. 12; and a collection of lamentations in which was an elegy composed by Jeremiah on Josiah's death (2 Chron. xxxv. 25).

In 1 Chron. i.-ix. we have only a few references to the origin of the genealogical lists. Thus ix. 1 it is said that the genealogies of the northern tribes were written in *the book of the kings of Israel and Judah*, of which we have spoken already. In 1 Chron. xxvii. 24 and Nehem. xii. 23 it is mentioned that the numbers and musters were put in *the chronicles of king David*. In Nehem. vii. 5 it is stated that Nehemiah found a register of the genealogy of those families that returned from exile with Zerubbabel. To this register, or the collection of registers among which it was found, it is likely that the Chronicle-writer refers in 1 Chron. iv. 33; v. 1, 7, 17; vii. 2, 7, 9, 40. Throughout most of this first part, the compiler relied on registers or lists, which he carefully followed. But his information respecting them is not definite. And it may be doubted whether they were complete and perfect in their details.

IV. THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL AND KINGS AMONG THE CHRONICLER'S SOURCES.—Were our present books of Samuel and Kings among the sources whence the Chronicle-writer drew?

This question is answered by De Wette and Movers in the affirmative, by others in the negative. The former critic adduces three arguments in favour of the hypothesis that the parallel accounts were derived from the earlier books.¹

1. The natural connexion in which the earlier accounts stand with those omitted in Chronicles (comp. 1 Sam. xxxi. with xviii.-xxx.; 2 Sam. v. 1 with ii. 1; 2 Sam. v. 13 with iii. 2-5; 2 Sam. vi. 16 with 20-22; 2 Sam. xi. 1, xii. 30, etc., with the intervening portion. 1 Kings x. 26-29 (= 2 Chron. ix. 26) with 1 Kings iv. 1, etc.; v. 2, etc.; 1 Kings ix. 10 (= 2 Chron. viii. 1) with vii. 1-12; 1 Kings xii. 15 (= 2 Chron. x. 15) with 1 Kings xi. 29, etc.).

This argument does not appear to us a valid one. It is true that a natural connexion between the different parts of the narratives contained in the earlier books is oftener presented than in the Chronicles; but that fact does not shew the frequent want of a natural connexion in the latter to have originated in its extraction of materials from Samuel and Kings. The more fragmentary character of the Chronicle-writing has arisen from

¹ Einleitung, p. 278 et seqq.

the inferior historical skill of the author. Supposing that both had other written sources, identical either wholly or in part, as we know they had, it is not improbable that the Chronicle-writer made excerpts from them, *less connected* than his predecessors, either because he was careless about giving well-connected descriptions, or because he wanted the capacity to do so. We are not ignorant of the fact that the Chronist occasionally refers to things which are not in his own work, but in the books of Kings; as in 2 Chron. x. 15, where he speaks of the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite (in 1 Kings xi. 30, etc.) and in 2 Chron. viii. 1 (comp. 1 Kings ix. 1), where he refers to 1 Kings vii. 1, etc.; but these phenomena do not prove the dependence of the Chronicles on the books of Kings, because such references to occurrences that are not described either in the Chronicles or Kings appear elsewhere, as in 2 Chron. xxxv. 3, where the existence of the ark of the covenant in the time of Josiah is presupposed.

2. Another argument is the originality of the accounts contained in Samuel and Kings compared with those of the Chronicles. This is a questionable assertion as stated broadly and without limitation. In many cases the materials presented in Kings and Samuel are in a state nearer the original than the same in Chronicles. In some the reverse is the fact. Both are extracts from more copious annals; and the higher age of the books of Samuel and Kings so far favours their higher claim to originality. But the difference observable in this respect may be owing chiefly to *the persons* who compiled the respective histories, and *the different objects* they had in view.

An example of the greater originality of Chronicles in some places is the account of Solomon's address to the people before his prayer at the dedication of the temple (2 Chron. vi. 3-11) compared with 1 Kings viii. 14-21. Examples of the reverse are however commoner; as in 2 Chron. viii. 1, 2, compared with 1 Kings ix. 10-14, where in consequence of the influence of later views respecting Solomon's greatness, instead of Hiram's sending not only materials for building the temple but also gold and receiving from Solomon twenty villages in the neighbourhood of Tyre or the surrounding province, we read merely of *cities* restored by Solomon to Hiram.

3. The certainty that the Chronist must have known the earlier books. This is a sound argument, which Hävernicks has not answered, as we shall presently see. Denying the validity of all these considerations, Hävernicks¹ and Keil² adduce some positive grounds against the hypothesis, that the books of

¹ Einleitung II. i., p. 206.

² Einleitung, p. 430.

Kings and Samuel were used as sources by the Chronicle-writer.

1. The circumstance that both narratives agree with one another, and have parallel sections only when both cite their sources.

But no more than fifteen verses appear after the last citation of sources in the Chronicles, in which the destruction of the Jewish state is described in very brief terms, because the writer was unwilling to dwell upon melancholy pictures. It is not at all improbable that he may have employed the Kings up to this time and not after, because he could not otherwise have attained to the extreme brevity he wished.

2. The different arrangement of materials in both works.

No weight attaches to this argument. All the difference of arrangement that exists is not great, and is sufficiently explained by the use of other sources in addition, and the independence of the writer.

3. The many historical additions which the Chronicles have in the parallel sections. These also are accounted for as the last.

4. The apparent contradictions in the parallel relations.

These are explained by the use of other sources besides, on which the writer may have sometimes relied more than on the accounts in Kings. The compilers of the historical books were not solicitous about producing a well-connected, consistent account of things, which should be in perfect harmony with other works.

Thus the considerations produced by Keil are singularly wanting in validity. Although we cannot subscribe to all the arguments of De Wette in favour of the use of Kings by the Chronicle-writer, we must believe his view to be correct. If the books of Kings existed for a considerable time before our author wrote, he must have known them. It is admitted that he knew and used Genesis in ch. i.-ii. 2. It is also allowed that other O. T. historical books were in existence. He collated earlier historical works *not canonical*, as is also conceded, because he repeatedly refers to them. If then he knew the canonical books, as we presume he did, why should it be thought that he abstained from using them? They would have facilitated his labour. The critics who suppose him to have ignored the *canonical* histories and to have relied solely on *others*, appear to us to disparage the former. All the probabilities favour the opinion that he had before him the older historical books now in the canon. It is true he does not cite them; but that is not weighty against their use, because he refers to his sources *not as vouchers for the credibility of his narratives*, but as containing more copious information than he supplies. If he took from

the books of Kings what seemed to his purpose, he would scarcely refer to them for fuller information, because they too were extracted from sources which he possessed, and were little more than an abridgment, like his own work. But the most convincing proof that he both *knew* and *used* the books of Samuel and Kings is furnished by parallels that are frequently verbal. Thus in 2 Chron. i. 14-17 there is a paragraph almost verbally coinciding with 1 Kings x. 26-29. 1 Chron. xvii. and xviii. are in many places verbally parallel with 2 Sam. vii. and viii. Comp. also 1 Chron. xix. 1-xx. 1 with 2 Sam. x.-xi. 1; 2 Chron. x. 1-xi. 4 with 1 Kings xii. 1-24; 2 Chron. xv. 16-18 with 1 Kings xv. 13-15; xxv. 1-4, 17-28 with 2 Kings xiv. 1-6, 8-20; xxxiii. 1-9 with 2 Kings xxi. 1-9; xxxiii. 21-25 with 2 Kings xxi. 19-26. The deviations are often the best index of the author's use of the earlier books, because they are of a nature to shew *design*. Thus in 1 Kings xii. 7, where we read that the old men advised Rehoboam in these words, "if thou *wilt be a servant* unto this people this day, and *wilt serve them* and answer them, and speak good words to them," etc., the Chronist represents them as saying "if thou be kind to this people, and please them, and speak good words to them," etc., altering the terms expressive of the king being *a servant* to his people, because they seemed unsuitable to royal dignity (2 Chron. x. 7). It will be shewn hereafter, that the Chronicle-writer has often changed expressions and phrases in order to make the sense clearer. And in one instance at least, he has resolved *Tarshish-ships*, תַּרְשִׁישִׁי אֲנִיּוֹת (1 Kings xxii. 49) into *ships to go to Tarshish* אֲנִיּוֹת לָלֶכֶת תַּרְשִׁישִׁי (2 Chron. xx. 36), incorrectly.

We can also shew where an extract or abridgment is given; as in 2 Chron. xxxiv. 7 taken from 2 Kings xxiii. 4-20, the termination in both being identical. He also felt the difficulty involved in the statement of 2 Sam. xxiv. 9 viz., "the men of Judah were five hundred thousand men" (which the writer believed to include Levi and Benjamin, though erroneously, because in the time of David *Judah*, as distinguished from Israel, could only mean the tribe itself) and endeavoured to avoid it by the statement, "Levi and Benjamin counted he not among them: for the king's word was abominable to Joab;" not perceiving that the remark was inappropriate, betraying nothing but his own remoteness from the time of David.

V. EXAMINATION OF 1 CHRON. I.-IX.—The first part, 1 Chron. i.-ix., contains genealogical and statistical registers, some of them occurring in other historical books of the Old Testament; some containing single names appearing in canonical books elsewhere, along with a number of new ones; others entirely pecu-

liar to the Chronicles. Thus the genealogies in ch. i.-ii. 2, relating to the ante-mosaic period are all contained in the book of Genesis, though they are here compressed, as the following table will shew :—

- (a) 1 Chron. i. 1-4, from Gen. v.
 " i. 5-23, from Gen. x. 2-4, 6-8, 13-18, 22-29.
 " i. 24-27, from Gen. xi. 10-26.
 " i. 29-33, from Gen. xxv. 12-16, 1-4.
 " i. 35-54, from Gen. xxxvi. 10-43.
 " ii. 1, 2, from Gen. xxxvi. 23-26, and xlv. 8, etc.

It is apparent that although these registers of descent are found in Genesis *substantially*, they are not there *verbally*; but have been taken by the Chronicle-writer and abbreviated as much as possible. The abridgment consists in the omission of connecting words between the links of the register, such as *בן* or *בני* son or sons, and the want of such members between the proper names as serve to shew the right relation between the latter (comp. i. 24-27). Few historical notices also are retained, such as are attached to individuals in Genesis, ex. gr. the remarks respecting Enoch (v. 24), Nimrod (x. 9-12), etc.

Again, a number of names and families met with in earlier historical books occur in Chronicles in a different genealogical connection, or at the head of longer lists peculiar to our books.

- (b) 1 Chron. ii. 3, etc.—The sons of Judah—Gen. xxxviii.
 " ii. 5—The sons of Pharez—Gen. xlv. 12.
 " ii. 10-12—The ancestors of David—Ruth iv. 19-22.
 " ii. 13-17—David's brethren—1 Sam. xvi. 6, etc.
 " iii. 1-9—The sons of David, both those born in Hebron and in Jerusalem—2 Sam. iii. 2-6; v. 11-16.
 " iii. 10, 16—Kings of the race of David—The books of Kings.
 " iv. 24—The sons of Simeon—Gen. xlv. 10; Ex. vi. 15; Num. xxvi. 12, 13.
 " iv. 28-32—The dwelling places of the Simeonites—Josh. xix. 2-7.
 " v. 3—The sons of Reuben—Gen. xlv. 9; Ex. vi. 14; Num. xxvi. 5.
 " v. 27-29—The sons of Levi—Gen. xlv. 11; Ex. vi. 18, 23; xxviii. 1.
 " vi. 2-4—The sons of Levi—Ex. vi. 17-19.
 " vi. 39-66—The dwelling places of the Levites—Josh. xxi. 10-39.
 " vii. 1—The sons of Issachar—Gen. xlv. 13; Num. xxvi. 23, etc.
 " vii. 6—The sons of Benjamin—Gen. xlv. 21; Num. xxvi. 38, etc.
 " vii. 13—The sons of Naphtali—Gen. xlv. 24; Num. xxvi. 48, etc.
 " vii. 14-19—The sons of Manasseh—Num. xxvi. 29, etc.
 " vii. 20, etc.—The sons of Ephraim—Num. xxvi. 34-38.
 " vii. 30, etc.—The sons of Asher—Gen. xlv. 17; Num. xxvi. 44, etc.
 " viii. 1-5—The sons of Benjamin—Gen. xlv. 21; Num. xxvi. 38, etc.
 " viii. 29-40 } The descendants of Saul—1 Sam. ix. 1; xiv. 49-51.
 " ix. 35-44 }

There are many difficulties in this genealogical part, which cannot be resolved from want of data to guide us. The most obvious are these: ii. 6, "The sons of Zerah; Zimri, and Ethan, and Heman, and Calcol, and Dara: five of them in all." But in 1 Kings v. 11, we find, "Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman,

and Chalcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol." Here *Dara* and *Darda* may be regarded as the same name; a letter being left out of the one which appears in the other. In the one place these persons are called the sons of *Zerah*; in the other, of *Mahol*. It is wholly improbable that different persons are intended in Chronicles and Kings. The similarity is too great for this assumption. The names of Ethan and Heman appear elsewhere as famous singers in the time of David. They belonged to the tribe of Levi; whereas the Ethan and Heman here mentioned belonged to that of Judah. In 1 Kings v. 11, the title *Ezrahite* applied to Ethan may mean that he was son of *Zerah*. The difficulty which we cannot remove is, that in the one passage *Mahol* is the father, in the other *Zerah*.

In ii. 49, we read that the daughter of Caleb was Achsa, and in verse 50 that Caleb was the son of Hur. In verse 9 *Chelubai* appears as the son of Hezron, while in verse 18 he is called *Caleb* the son of Hezron. It is tolerably clear that *Caleb* and *Chelubai* are merely different forms of the same name belonging to the same person. Were there two Calebs; one the son of Jephunneh, who belonged to Joshua's time; the other son of Hezron here described? For the reasons advanced by Bertheau, we think not. Yet we take the term son in its proper sense, not in the loose way he understands it. Different persons are assigned as the father here and in Joshua.

In iii. 15, among the four sons of Josiah Shallum is mentioned as the *fourth*, who is the same person as Jehoahaz, the successor of his father on the throne of Judah. It is evident that the order in this place is not that of age, and therefore there is no mistake as some have supposed.

In iii. 19, Zerubbabel is given as the son of Pedaiah. But in Ezra iii. 2, 8; v. 2; Hag. i. 1, 14; ii. 2; Neh. xii. 1, he is called the son of Shealtiel or Salathiel. Here Movers¹ and Hävernicks² resort to the assumption that Shealtiel dying childless, his brother Pedaiah married his widow and begat Zerubbabel, who was in this case the *legal* son of Shealtiel. But it is by no means certain that Pedaiah was brother of Salathiel. The language of 1 Chron. iii. 17-19 may with equal, or even greater, probability imply that Salathiel was son of Jeconiah; in which case he was the *brother* not the *son* of Assir, and *uncle* of Salathiel. In any case the remedy proposed for saving the credibility of the Chronist is artificial. The same may be said of the assumption that by the son of Pedaiah is meant an older Zerubbabel, the parenthetic words "Salathiel his son" (ver. 17) referring to the well known Zerubbabel, in which case the

¹ Kritische Untersuchungen, p. 229.

² Einleitung, II. i. p. 185.

Chronicle-writer as the compiler of Ezra's book is not inconsistent with himself; and among the eight children of Zerubbabel mentioned in verses 19, 20, neither Abiud (Matt. i. 13), nor Rhesa (Luke iii. 27) nor Joakim (Esdras v. 5) is given as son of Zerubbabel, because the three belonged to the younger person of that name. But it is vain to look for perfect consistency in the Chronicle-writer; and the omission of these three sons (if they were such) of Zerubbabel can be satisfactorily accounted for. Identifying, therefore, the Zerubbabel of Chronicles with him spoken of in Haggai, Ezra, and Nehemiah, we give the preference to the latter authorities, which make him son of Shealtiel. In vi. 7 the name Amminadab as one of the sons of Kohath is singular; for in Ex. vi. 21, and afterwards in verse 21 of this sixth chapter we find Izhar instead. It is hazardous to assume that the two names refer to one and the same person. Bertheau allows that there is a mistake here.

In 1 Chron. vi. 61 it is stated that ten cities were given by Lot to the sons of Kohath out of the half tribe of Manasseh. This contradicts Josh. xxi. 20-26 where we see that some of the ten cities were in the territories of Ephraim and Dan. It is said indeed in the sixty-sixth and following verses that the sons of Kohath had cities out of the tribe of Ephraim, but here the entire number is 8 instead of 10. Besides, Gezer and Shechem were not cities of refuge, as stated.

Timna in i. 36 is represented as a son of Eliphaz; but in Gen. xxxvi. 12 as his concubine. Bertheau explains the existence of Timna in the verse by the circumstance that the Chronicle-writer, wishing to throw light upon the accounts in Genesis regarding Timna Eliphaz's concubine and the mother of Amalek, and to explain the connexion between the two races of Timna and Amalek on the one hand, and the five other races of Amalek on the other, counted her in a line with these races among the sons of Eliphaz. This explanation is far-fetched and unnatural.

In 1 Chron. ix. 35-44 we have a duplicate of viii. 29, 40 with a few deviations, viz., Jehiel, Ner, and Mikloth are wanting in viii. 29, 31; Shimeam is Shimeah (viii. 32), and Ahaz in viii. 35 is omitted in ix. 41. For Jehoadah and Rapha in viii. 36, 37 we have Javah and Rephaiah in ix. 42, 43. At ix. 44 the two verses viii. 39, 40 are omitted.

(c) Lists which are peculiar to Chronicles are found among the chapters referred to in (b), as ii. 18-53; iii. 16-24, iv. 2-23, 34-43; v. 1-26, 33-36; vi. 1-34. It will be seen that these are more numerous than such as are commonly admitted to have been taken from the older biblical books. Because they are not found elsewhere it is unnecessary to view them with suspicion,

or to consider them the arbitrary addition and fabrication of the writer himself, as Gramberg does.

Whence were the names in (a) taken? There is little doubt that Genesis was the source. But the form here is different, and therefore it may be asked, Did the compiler of Chronicles derive the accounts *immediately* from Genesis, or did he take them from some other historical work in which they had already got their present form? We believe that he borrowed them at once from Genesis, abridging and contracting them according to the object he had in view.

Whence were the genealogies in (b) and (c) taken? In consequence of their characteristic nature, they must have been borrowed from other sources than the historical books of the Old Testament. The Pentateuch, Joshua, Samuel and Kings could not have furnished them; for they have a better connexion and are more complete than the fragmentary genealogies in those books with which they coincide. The differences are too great to admit of their derivation from the canonical writings. They must therefore have been compiled from old genealogical and topographical lists existing among the author's contemporaries. This is plainly intimated by himself in various places.

On comparing the different notices with one another, it will be found that the names vary very much. Various causes contributed to this result, one consisting in the mistakes of transcribers. Tradition had also varied in progress of time, and the genealogies varied accordingly.

Great difficulty arises as to the original relation between 1 Chron. ix. 1-34 with Neh. xi. 3-36. Three points require to be investigated, viz., whether the one genealogy was derived from the other; whether they were taken independently from a common source; and to what time they refer. We begin with the last, because that determines the other two, or rather obviates their discussion.

It is apparent that Neh. xi. gives a list of the principal inhabitants of Jerusalem *after* the exile. Does 1 Chron. ix. also present a post-exile list of those dwelling at Jerusalem? Keil affirms that it relates to the inhabitants of Jerusalem *before* the exile, laying considerable stress on ix. 2 "*the first inhabitants that dwelt in their possessions, in their cities,*" contrasted with Neh. xi. 1, "And the rulers of the people *dwelt at Jerusalem,*" the former not relating, as he thinks, to the inhabitants of Jerusalem *after* the exile, but to the ante-exilian inhabitants of the land; while the latter relates to the returned captives who dwelt in Jerusalem.¹ This kind of reasoning is more ingenious

¹ Einleitung, p. 420.

than satisfactory. The first verse of 1 Chron. ix., is from the Chronicle-writer himself, referring his readers for farther information to the source whence he drew most of the preceding genealogies. "So all Israel were reckoned by genealogies; and behold, they were written in the book of the kings of Israel and Judah *who were carried away to Babylon for their transgression.*" The words in italics shew merely that the Chronist himself lived after the captivity. But in the second verse, there is an obvious transition to the post-exile time: "Now the first inhabitants that dwelt in their possessions in their cities were the Israelites, the priests, the Levites, and the Nethinims," etc. In ix. 16 mention is also made of Berechiah, "that dwelt in the villages of the Netophathites," which villages are referred to in Neh. xii. 28, *after the captivity.* The great difference of the two is also produced by Keil as an argument that they are different lists belonging to different times. But is *the similarity* not greater than the diversity? Both registers are arranged alike. Their general plan corresponds. This, however, is not all. Not only are the inhabitants of Jerusalem enumerated according to one type; there is also a remarkable coincidence of names and incidental notices, amid many deviations. The leading contents of both are the same. Allowance should be made for the numerous mistakes made in the transcription of names. Of the sons of Judah are mentioned Uthai, Asaiah, and Jeuel (1 Chron. ix. 4-6), two of which are in Neh. xi. 4, 5, viz., Athaiah and Maaseiah, Jeuel being omitted. Five sons of Benjamin are given in 1 Chron. ix. 7-9; of whom we find one in Neh. xi. 7, 9, Sallu; and probably another, Hodaviah, may be discovered in Judah, Neh. xi. 9. Three are omitted. In Chronicles the priests are reckoned thus: Jedaiah, Jehoiarib, Jachin, Azariah, Adaiah, Maasiai, which are the same in Neh. xi. 10, etc., Azariah being there Seriah, and Maasiai, Amashai. Among the Levites are Shemaiah in both lists, Bakbakkar (Bakbukiah in Nehemiah), Mattaniah, Zichri (Zabdi in Nehemiah). Obadiah the son of Shemaiah, the son of Galal, the son of Jeduthun, stands the same in both. Of the porters are specified Shallum, Akkub, Talmon, and Ahimar in Chronicles; but in Nehemiah only the two, Akkub and Talmon. From verse 18-34 is peculiar to the Chronicle-writer, and shews his prevailing Levitical spirit. The thirty-third and thirty-fourth verses form two subscriptions, the former relating to 14-16, the latter to 14-32. The parallel extends no farther than the seventeenth verse of 1 Chron. ix. and the nineteenth of Neh. xi.

From this brief comparison of the two genealogies it is apparent that they agree in the main points, *i.e.*, in their account of the *heads* of families; while they also touch in subordinate

particulars and in scattered remarks derived from the source or sources used, not from the compiler. Hence they could not have originated independently of one another. They refer to the same persons and time, *i.e.*, the post-exile inhabitants of Jerusalem.

Which of the two is the original?

It has been thought by De Wette¹ and Zunz² that Nehemiah is the original and the other a copy. No comparison which we can make of them leads to such conclusion. Sometimes the one is more copious, and apparently more original than the other; sometimes again, the other. If the writer of the Chronicles merely enlarged and altered the list in Nehemiah, he proceeded in the most careless way, so as to render his genealogies more obscure than those he worked upon. He has dislocated the list in a way that seems very arbitrary. The most natural hypothesis is that both were taken from the same source. The substantial similarity as well as the divergences are best explained in that way. And they do not relate to the same time precisely. That in Nehemiah is earlier.

It is difficult to ascertain the time at which the heads of the families mentioned in the ninth chapter lived in Jerusalem. There is no internal mark which is important in this view. The genealogical register in the book of Nehemiah is not so suddenly broken off; and there are some particulars communicated in it which Bertheau thinks to be weighty in settling the time. In verse twenty-four the Stadtholder of the Persian king is mentioned. He was the son of Meshezabeel, the latter one of the chiefs of the people who sealed the covenant in the time of Nehemiah (x. 21). In like manner the overseer of the Levites at Jerusalem was Uzzi, son of Bani (xi. 22); and one Bani appears among the heads of the people (x. 14). The heads of the Levities (Neh. xi. 16) Shabbethai and Jozabad were contemporaries of Ezra according to viii. 7. Such are the evidences Bertheau finds for the composition of the genealogical list in the time of Nehemiah.³

We hold with Herzfeld⁴ that the list in Chronicles was written somewhat later than that in Nehemiah. Some considerations indeed which he adduces for this view are scarcely valid; but one founded on numbers is weighty, which Bertheau⁵ has not succeeded in overthrowing. It would appear that in the interval between Neh. xi. and 1 Chron. ix. an important accession had been made to the inhabitants of Jerusalem; for of

¹ Einleitung, p. 264.

² Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, p. 31.

³ Die Bücher der Chronik, p. 99.

⁴ Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. i. pp. 298, 299.

⁵ Die Bücher der Chronik, p. 99.

the tribe of Judah there dwelt according to Neh. xi., 468; according to 1 Chron. ix., 690. Of Benjamin there were 928 according to Nehemiah; 956 according to 1 Chron. ix. Of priests according to Neh. xi., 1192; according to 1 Chron. ix., 1760. Of Levitical porters according to Neh. xi., 172; according to 1 Chron. ix., 212. A long interval should not be assumed, because the population would increase rapidly, in consequence of what is stated in Neh. xi. 1. The attempt of Bertheau to invalidate this argumentation is unsuccessful.

VI. RELATION OF CHRONICLES TO THE OTHER HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.—It is apparent to the most cursory reader, that a number of things which had been already given in the earlier writings of the Old Testament appear again in Chronicles. It is therefore necessary to compare the different statements of the same particulars to be able to judge of the peculiarities of the books before us.

We have already considered the connexion between the genealogical tables in the first part, and the Old Testament books. It remains that we confine ourselves to the properly historical portion, commencing with the tenth chapter, or rather the thirty-fifth verse of the ninth. Here more than forty parallel sections of greater or less compass come under examination, side by side, with others in Samuel and Kings, as the following table shews:—

1 Chron. x. 1-12..	1 Sam. xxxi.
„ xi. 1-9..	2 Sam. v. 1-3; 6-10
„ xi. 10-47	„ xxiii. 8-39
„ xiii. 1-14	„ vi. 1-11
„ xiv. 1-7	„ v. 11-16
„ xiv. 8-17	„ v. 17-25
„ xv. xvi.	„ vi. 12-23
„ xvii.	„ vii.
„ xix.	„ x.
„ xx. 1-3	„ xi. 1; xii. 26-31
„ xx. 4-8	„ xxi. 18-22
„ xxi.	„ xxiv.
2 Chron. i. 2-13..	1 Kings iii. 4-15
„ i. 14-17	„ x. 26-29
„ ii.	„ v. 15-32
„ iii. 1-v. 1	„ vi. vii. 13-51
„ v. 2-vii. 10..	„ viii.
„ vii. 11-22	„ ix. 10-28
„ ix. 1-12	„ x. 1-13
„ ix. 13-28	„ x. 14-29

„ x. 1-xi. 4	„ xii. 1-24
„ xii. 2, 3, 9-16	„ xiv. 21-31
„ xiii. 1, 2, 22, 23	„ xv. 1, 2, 6-8
„ xiv. 1, 2; xv. 16-19 ..	„ xv. 11-16
„ xvi. 1-6, 11-14	„ xv. 17-22, 23, 24
„ xviii. 2-34..	„ xxii. 2-35
„ xx. 31-xxi. 1	„ xxii. 41-51
„ xxi. 5-10, 20	2 Kings viii. 17-24
„ xxii. 1-9	„ viii. 25-29; ix. 16-28; x. 12-14
„ xxii. 10-xxiii. 21.. ..	„ xi.
„ xxiv. 1-14, 23-27	„ xii. 1-22
„ xxv. 1-4, 11, 17-28 ..	„ xiv. 1-14, 17-20
„ xxvi. 1-4, 21-23.. ..	„ xiv. 21, 22; xv. 2-5, 7
„ xxvii. 1-3, 7-9	„ xv. 33-36, 38
„ xxviii. 1-4	„ xvi. 2-4
„ xxviii. 26, 27	„ xvi. 19, 20
„ xxix. 1, 2	„ xviii. 2, 3
„ xxxii. 1-21	„ xviii. 13-xix. 37
„ xxxii. 24, 25, 32, 33 ..	„ xx. 1, 2, 20, 21
„ xxxiii. 1-10, 20-25 ..	„ xxi. 1-9 18-24
„ xxxiv. 1, 2, 8-28	„ xxii.
„ xxxiv. 29-32	„ xxiii. 1-20
„ xxxv. 1, 18-24, 26, } 27; xxxvi. 1-4 .. }	„ xxiii. 21-23, 28, 29-34
„ xxxvi. 5, 6, 8	„ xxiii. 36, 37; xxiv. 1, 6
„ xxxvi. 9, 10	„ xxiv. 8-10, 14, 17
„ xxxvi. 11-12	„ xxiv. 18, 19
„ xxxvi. 22, 23	Ezra i. 1, 2

The agreement, as will be observed, is often verbal; but the deviations are also frequent and considerable. The differences between the parallels may be classed under three heads viz., such as relate to the matter; such as concern the language in which facts are narrated, and those which concern both matter and language, injuriously affecting the sense.

I. Deviations in the matter of the narrative. Here there are omissions, additions, and a different order.

1. *Omissions.*

Of primary facts.

David's kindness to Mephibosheth and Ziba, 2 Sam. ix.

His adultery with Bathsheba, and Uriah's murder, 2 Sam. xi. 2-xii. 25.

The surrender of Saul's seven sons to the heathen Gibeonites as an atonement, 2 Sam. xxi. 1-14.

The large episodes respecting David's family history, including

Absalom's rebellion and its consequences, with Sheba's revolt, 2 Sam. xiii.-xx.

A war with the Philistines, 2 Sam. xxi. 15-17.

David's song of thanksgiving and last words, 2 Sam. xxii.-xxiii.

Adonijah's usurpation of the kingdom, and the anointing of Solomon as king, 1 Kings i.

The encounter between David and Michal, when the latter came forth to mock him, 2 Sam. vi. 20-23.

David's last charge, 1 Kings ii. 1-9.

Solomon's deposition and banishment of Abiathar, and his murder of Joab and Shimei, 1 Kings, ii. 26-46.

Solomon's marriage with Pharaoh's daughter, 1 Kings iii. 1.

His wise judgment, iii. 16-28.

His princes and officers, the peace and largeness of his kingdom, the daily provision of his household, his stables, etc., 1 Kings iv.

The building of his palace, 1 Kings vii. 1-12.

His wives, concubines, idolatry, and threatened punishment, 1 Kings xi. 1-13.

His adversaries, 1 Kings xi. 14-40.

The copiously detailed transactions which happened at Hebron during the reign of David, 2 Sam. i.-iv.

Description of the ornaments and vessels of the temple, 1 Kings vii. 13-39.

Prayer of Solomon, 1 Kings viii. 56-61.

The taking of Gath in war with the Syrians, and delivering up of the temple-vessels to the Syrian king, 2 Kings xii. 17, 18.

Many omissions are also in the histories of Ahaz and Hezekiah, 2 Kings xvi. 5-18; xviii. 4-8.

2. *Additions or interpolations.*

(a) *Primary facts.*

A list of those who attached themselves to David during Saul's life, and the number of warriors who chose him king, at Hebron, 1 Chron. xii.

David's preparations for building the temple, 1 Chron. xxii.

The number and distribution of the Levites and priests, and the settlement of their employments, 1 Chron. xxiii.-xxvi.

Accounts of David's army and officers, 1 Chron. xxvii.

His last directions and regulations in a solemn assembly before his death, 1 Chron. xxviii. xxix.

Arrangements of Rehoboam for the purpose of strengthening his kingdom; the reception into Judah of the priests driven out of Israel; the wives and children of the king, 2 Chron. xi. 5-23.

Abijah's war with Jeroboam, 2 Chron. xiii. 2b.-20; his wives and children, 21-22.

Asa's victory over Zerah an Ethiopian who invaded Judah, 2 Chron. xiv. 8-14.

Address of the prophet Azariah to Asa, in consequence of which the king renounces idolatry, 2 Chron. xv. 1-15.

Address of the prophet Hanani, and how Asa receives his admonition, 2 Chron. xvi. 7-10.

Jehoshaphat's care in securing his kingdom, his endeavours to extirpate idolatry, and to promote the knowledge of religion among the people, 2 Chron. xvii.

Jehu's opinion of Jehoshaphat's covenant with Ahab; and Jehoshaphat's arrangements for restoring the due administration of justice, 2 Chron. xix.

The invasion of various eastern peoples, and how they destroyed one another, so that the arms of Jehoshaphat and the Jews had no share in the victory, 2 Chron. xx. 1-30.

His provision for his sons, and their slaughter by Jehoram who succeeded to the throne, 2 Chron. xxi. 2-4.

Jehoram's idolatry and punishment, including a letter to him from Elijah, 2 Chron. xxi. 11-19.

Death of Jehoiada and apostasy of the people; the appearance of the prophet Zechariah and his death, 2 Chron. xxiv. 15-22.

Amaziah's equipments, and his hiring of soldiers out of the northern kingdom, whom he sent home again at the exhortation of a prophet, xxv. 5-10.

His introduction of Edomite idolatry, and censure by a prophet, xxv. 14-16.

Uzziah's fortunate wars, his buildings, and armed force, 2 Chron. xxvi. 6-15.

Jotham's successful war with the Ammonites, 2 Chron. xxvii. 5-6.

Hezekiah's celebration of the passover, xxx. 1-27.

His arrangements for the regular worship of Jehovah, and for the support of the priests and Levites, 2 Chron. xxxi. 2-21.

Manasseh's deportation to Babylon, his conversion and restoration, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11-13.

His measures towards strengthening the kingdom, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 14.

(b) Short notices in the books of Samuel and Kings are here enlarged and completed. Thus the history of bringing the ark of the covenant into the house of Obed-edom, and its solemn entry into Jerusalem, is enlarged by an account of the part which the priests and Levites took in the service; and by the functions they discharged in attending continually upon the ark

after it was fixed on mount Zion, 1 Chron. xiii., xv., xvi., compared with 2 Sam. vi.

The description of the brazen scaffold on which Solomon kneeled is new, 2 Chron. vi. 13; comp. 1 Kings viii. 22.

The concluding verses of Solomon's prayer, 2 Chron. vi. 40-42, which are the same as Psalm cxxxii. 7-9 with some slight exceptions, are wanting in 2 Kings viii. 53.

The notice of fire from heaven consuming the sacrifice, 2 Chron. vii. 1, is not in 2 Kings viii., ix.

The divine promise in 2 Chron. vii. 12-16 is extended; comp. 1 Kings ix. 3.

Shishak's invasion of Judea is lengthened by an account of the strength of his army and Shemaiah's address, 2 Chron. xii. 1-12; comp. 1 Kings xiv. 25-28.

The cause of the leprosy in the forehead of Uzziah is given in 2 Chron. xxvi. 16-21.; comp. 2 Kings xv. 5.

How Joab was the first that got up on mount Zion when the Jebusites possessed it; and how he afterwards repaired the rest of the city, 1 Chron. xi. 6, 8; comp. 2 Sam. v. 8, 9.

The stature of the Egyptian slain by Benaiah, 1 Chron. xi. 23, comp. 2 Sam. xxiii. 21.

Solomon made the brazen sea and the pillars and the vessels of brass from the brass brought by David out of the cities of Hadarezer, 1 Chron. xviii. 8; comp. 2 Sam. viii. 8.

Abishai son of Zeruah slew Edomites in the valley of Salt, 1 Chron. xviii. 12; comp. 2 Sam. viii. 13.

The Ammonites took the Syrians into pay for a *thousand talents*, 1 Chron. xix. 6; comp. 2 Sam. x. 6.

(c) Insertions, consisting of reflections by the author, or his own views assigned to the persons described.

It is stated that Saul died for his transgressions against the word of the Lord, and also for his inquiring of a witch instead of from the Lord; and the kingdom passed over to David, 1 Chron. x. 13, 14; comp. 1 Sam. xxxi. 12.

It is said that David was anointed king according to the word of Jehovah by Samuel, 1 Chron. xi. 3; comp. 2 Sam. v. 3.

It is stated that Edom and Libnah had revolted, as a punishment for Jehoram's idolatry, 2 Chron. xxi. 10; comp. 2 Kings viii. 10.

"But Amaziah would not hear, *for it came of God that he might deliver them into the hand of their enemies, because they sought after the gods of Edom*," 2 Chron. xxv. 20; comp. 2 Kings xiv. 11.

"And Solomon brought up the daughter of Pharaoh out of the city of David into the house that he had built for her: *for he said, My wife shall not dwell in the house of David king of*

Israel, because the places are holy whereunto the ark of the Lord hath come," 2 Chron. viii. 11. Here a reason is assigned for Solomon's building a house for Pharaoh's daughter, which is nothing more than the writer's own conjecture, and is seen to be incorrect from the notices in Kings (1 Kings ix. 24).

"And Joab answered, The Lord make his people an hundred times so many more as they be: but, my lord the king, are they not all my lord's servants? *Why then doth my lord require this thing? Why will he be a cause of trespass to Israel?*" 1 Chron. xxi. 3. Here the short question of Joab in 2 Sam. xxiv. receives an alteration intended to explain it.

"Only the Lord give thee wisdom and understanding, and give thee charge concerning Israel," etc. 1 Chron. xxii. 12. This wish of David's is taken from the narrative of Solomon's dream, 1 Kings iii. 5-15.

The address of Jehovah to Solomon by night (2 Chron. vii. 12, etc.) is enlarged by the addition of verses 13 and 14, taken from 2 Chron. vi. 26, 27; comp. 1 Kings ix. 3, etc., where the words here inserted are properly absent from Jehovah's address.

3. The Chronicles also differ from the books of Samuel and Kings in the order in which the occurrences are related. We may compare the following sections:—

1 Chron. xi. 1-9	2 Sam. vi. 1-10.
„ xi. 10-47	„ xxiii. 8-10
„ xiii.	„ vi. 3-11
„ xiv.	„ v. 11-25
„ xv.	„ vi. 12, etc.
2 Chron. i. 3-13	1 Kings iii. 4-14
„ i. 14-17	„ x. 26-29
„ ii.	„ v.

From this brief list, it will be obvious that coincidences in the order of succession is the rule, and differences the exception.

II. The linguistic deviations exhibited by the books of Chronicles compared with the earlier historical works included in the canon, are orthographical, grammatical, and exegetical.

1. Orthographical.

(a) The *scriptio plena* instead of the *defectiva*, as **לְיָיִד** 1 Chron. ii. 15; iii. 1, 9, etc., for **לְיָד** 1 Sam. xvi. 13, 19; Ruth iv. 17, 22. **לְשִׁאֲלָלִי** 1 Chron. xviii. 10 for **לְשִׁאֲלָלִי** 2 Sam. viii. 10. **אֲנִיּוֹת** 2 Chron. viii. 18 for **אֲנִיּוֹת** 1 Kings ix. 27. This mode of orthography is not peculiar to the Chronicles, but belongs to the later books generally—to those written during, as well as after, the exile; yet it is much more frequent in the post-exile ones.

(b) Variations according to a later, and for the most part Aramaisising pronunciation; as the interchange of א the softer consonant with the harder ה at the beginning and end of words; thus הִיךְ 1 Chron. xiii. 12 for אִיךְ 2 Sam. vi. 9. הָרִי 2 Chron. xi. 35 for אָרִי 2 Sam. xxiii. 33. הָרָם 2 Chron. x. 18 for אָרָם 1 Kings xiii. 18. The resolution of *dagesh forte* into a proper letter, as דְּרִמְשֶׁק for רִמְשֶׁק in Kings.

2. Grammatical.

(a) To this head belong the regular mode of writing instead of the irregular, abridged, or incorrect mode employed in the earlier books as מְבִיא 1 Chron. xi. 2, for מְבִי 2 Sam. v. 2. כָּסָא 2 Chron. ix. 18 for כָּסָה 1 Kings x. 19. יְקִהֵל 2 Chron. v. 2, for the defective and in this case unusual יְקַהֵל 1 Kings viii. 1.

(b) To this head also belongs the later form of a word instead of the earlier, as מְלָכֹת 1 Chron. xiv. 2; xvii. 11, 14, for the older מַמְלָכָה 2 Sam. v. 12.; vii. 12, 16. תַּחֲנוּן (2 Chron. vi. 21) for תַּחֲנִנָּה, 1 Kings viii. 30.

(c) The older or irregular flexion of a substantive or verb is changed into that belonging to the later usage, as אַרְיִים in 1 Kings x. 20, becomes in 2 Chron. ix. 19, אַרְיֹת. The unusual ending ה of the second person singular preterite masculine is omitted, as הִיִּית 1 Chron. ix. 12, for הִיִּתָּה, 2 Sam. x. 11. הָן in the second and third person plural of the future is dropped as יִדְעוּ 2 Chron. xxix. 35 for יִדְעוּן 1 Kings viii. 38, 43. הָ in the imperative is left out as הִפֵּר 2 Chron. xvi. 3, for הִפְרָה 1 Kings xv. 19. מָהֵר 2 Chron. xviii. 8, for מָהֵרָה 1 Kings xxii. 9. נָא with the imperative and future is dropped, as יֵאָמֶן 2 Chron. vi. 17, instead of יֵאָמֶן נָא, 1 Kings viii. 26. הִנֵּה 2 Chron. xviii. 12 for הִנֵּה נָא, 1 Kings xxii. 13.

(d) Alterations in construction are made; as the avoidance of the infinitive absolute with the finite verb, *ex. gr.*, 1 Chron. xiv. 10, נתנו אתן for נתנו, 2 Sam. v. 19. The personal pronoun is put before the finite verb; אֲנִי בָנִיתִי, 2 Chron. vi. 2, comp. 1 Kings viii. 13. הוּא הָעֵבִיר, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6 for הָעֵבִיר הוּא 2 Kings xxi. 5. The preposition אֶל is commonly used with verbs of motion, or ה local, where the simple accusative occurs in the earlier books, as שָׁכְמָה, 2 Chron. x. 1, for שָׁכַם, 1 Kings xii. 1. אֶל רָמוֹת, 2 Chron. xviii. 28, comp. עָלָה רָמוֹת, 1 Kings xxii. 29. ל is regularly omitted before מִן in the construction לְמוֹ *from*, עַד *unto*, as מִן-הַיּוֹם—עַד-הַיּוֹם, 1 Chron. xvii. 5, comp. 2 Sam. vii. 6.

3. Exegetical alterations of language embrace the following:

(a) The substitution of a younger or commoner synonym for an older or unusual one. Thus in 1 Chron. x. 12 we find גִּנְפָה *dead body*, for גָּנִיָּה in 1 Sam. xxxi. 12, belonging to the later usage of the language.

1 Chron. xvi. 3, בָּכַר לֶחֶם, *a loaf of bread*, instead of the unusual חֶלֶת לֶחֶם, *a cake of bread*, 2 Sam. vi. 19.

1 Chron. xv. 29, קָרָקַר וּמִשְׁחָק, *dancing and playing*, instead of the two words that appear no where else except in 2 Sam. vi. 16, מִפּוֹז וּמִכַּרְכַּר *leaping and dancing*.

1 Chron. xxi. 10, אֲנִי נֹטֶה וְגו', *I offer thee, etc.*, the younger אֲנִי being substituted for אֲנֹכִי, and the common נֹטֶה for the rarer נָטַל, 2 Sam. xxiv. 12.

2 Chron. ix. 17, זָהָב טָהוֹר, *pure gold*, for זָהָב מוֹפֵז, *the best gold*, 1 Kings x. 18.

2 Chron. iv. 16, נְחֹשֶׁת מְרוּקָה, *polished brass*. The adjective is מִמְרֵט in 1 Kings vii. 45.

2 Chron. xviii. 31, וַיִּסְבּוּ עָלָיו, *they compassed him about*, instead of וַיִּסְרוּ עָלָיו, *they turned themselves against him*, 1 Kings xxii. 31.

2 Chron. vii. 11, כָּל הַבָּא עָלֶיךָ, *all that came into his heart*, is an explanatory periphrasis of כָּל חֶשֶׁק, *all his desire*, 1 Kings ix. 1.

1 Chron. xxi. 20, וַיִּשָּׁב, *he turned back*, instead of וַיִּשְׁקָה, *he looked*, 2 Sam. xxiv. 20.

1 Chron. xiv. 9, וַיִּפְשְׁטוּ, *they spread themselves*, for וַיִּנְטְשׁוּ *they spread themselves*, 2 Sam. v. 18.

1 Chron. xiv. 15, אַתָּה תֵּצֵא בַּמִּלְחָמָה, *then thou shalt go out to battle*: this is a gloss on the difficult word אַתָּה תִּחְרֹץ *then do thou bestir thyself*, 2 Sam. v. 24.

1 Chron. xiv. 8, וַיֵּצֵא לִפְנֵיהֶם, *he went out against them*, for which in 2 Sam. v. 17 stands וַיֵּרֶד אֶל הַמְּצוּדָה, *he went down to the hold*, or rather, *to the chase*.

2 Chron. xvi. 4, אֶבֶל מַיִם, i.e., *Abel of the waters or sea*, because lying in the neighbourhood of lake Merom; for which we find in 1 Kings xv. 20 אֶבֶל-בֶּת-מַאֲחָח. The old or unusual geographical name is displaced to make way for the current one.

1 Chron. xx. 4, גֶּזֶר, for which גֹּב stands in 2 Sam. xxi. 18.

1 Chron. xix. 6, אֲרָם-נַחַרַּאִים or Mesopotamia, for which in 2 Sam. x. 6 stands בֶּת-רְהוֹב.

2 Chron. viii. 4, תַּדְמוֹר, this is the later Aramaean name;

for which we find the old genuine Hebrew one *Tammor*, in 1 Kings ix. 18.

1 Chron. xviii. 8, *Chun*: in 2 Sam. viii. 8 stands *Berothai*.

2 Chron xxiii. 20, *the high gate*, שַׁעַר הָעֵלְיוֹן, this was probably a temple-gate. But in 2 Kings xi. 19 we find שַׁעַר הַרְצִים, *the gate of the guard*. This was a gate which led into the royal palace. The confounding of the one with the other by the Chronist is improper.

(b) A more distinct reference is given to an indefinite expression:

1 Chron. xiii. 10, *because he put his hand to the ark*, for the indefinite expression of 2 Sam. vi. 7, *for his error*.

2 Chron. xi. 4, "And they obeyed the words of the Lord and returned from going against Jeroboam." This is more definite, and at the same time avoids the repetition of 1 Kings xii. 24, "They hearkened therefore to the word of the Lord, and returned to depart, according to the word of the Lord."

2 Chron. xxxiv. 24, "All the curses that are written in the book which they have read before the king of Judah," instead of "all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read," 2 Kings xxii. 16.

In 2 Chron. xxviii. 3, it is stated that Ahaz burnt his children in the fire, וַיַּבֵּעַ בָּאֵשׁ; but in 2 Kings xvi. 3, *he made his son to pass through the fire*, הַעֲבִיר בָּאֵשׁ, which may have the same sense, but is indefinite.

2 Chron. xxi. 7, "The Lord would not destroy *the house of David*, because of the covenant he had made with David," etc. In 2 Kings viii. 19 instead of *the house of David* we find *Judah*.

1 Chron. xi. 13, הוּא הִיָּה, these words are put as introductory to the deed to which the man owes his renown. They are not in 2 Sam. xxiii. 9, which is therefore obscure.

To avoid misapprehension, the Chronicle-writer has changed the preposition אֶל in the text of Samuel and Kings into עַל, as in 1 Chron. xix. 2 compared with 2 Sam. x. 2; 2 Chron. xvi. 4 compared with 1 Kings xv. 20.

2 Chron. xxii. 12, "And he was *with them* (אִתָּם) *hid in the house of God*," i.e., with his deliverer Jeshobeath, and his nurse. In 2 Kings xi. 3 it is אִתָּהּ *with her*, i.e., *the nurse alone*.

1 Chron. xxi. 1, *An adversary* provoked David, etc., instead of *Jehovah* as in 2 Sam. xxiv. 1.

(c) Superfluous or less suitable words are omitted, as:

1 Sam. xxxi. 3. The archers hit him
הַחֲמוּרִים.

In 1 Chron. x. 3 the word _____
which is harsh in its present position is
omitted.

1 Sam. xxxi. 11, מלי is superfluous.

In 1 Chron. x. 11 כל is substituted.

1 Sam. xxxi. 7, אמת הערים the cities.

In 1 Chron. x. 7 better *their cities*.

2 Sam. vi. 3. And they set the ark of God upon a new cart, and brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah.

1 Chron. xiii. 7. And they carried the ark of God in a new cart out of the house of Abinadab.—The hysteron proteron is thus avoided.

1 Kings viii. 1. Then Solomon assembled the elders of Israel unto king Solomon in Jerusalem.

2 Chron. v. 2. "Unto king Solomon" is omitted.

1 Kings xxii. 50. And Jehoshaphat slept with his fathers and was buried with his fathers in the city of David [his father].

2 Chron. xxi. 1. The words in brackets are omitted to avoid repetition.

2 Kings xxiii. 34. And Pharaoh-nechoh made Eliakim the son of Josiah king [in the room of Josiah his father].

2 Chron. xxxvi. 4. The words in brackets are omitted because Eliakim did not immediately succeed Josiah.

(d) Much oftener than the preceding do we find instances where single words or sentences are omitted by the Chronist to the injury of the connexion or sense.

1 Sam. xxxi. 12. All the valiant men arose, [and went all night] and took the body of Saul, and the bodies of his sons [from the wall of Beth-shan], and came to Jabesh [and burnt them there].

1 Chron. x. 12. The words in brackets are left out.

2 Sam. xi. 1-xii. 30.

In 1 Chron. xx. 1, the words "But David tarried at Jerusalem" are taken from 2 Sam. xi. 1; but as the section there connected with them, verses 2-xii. 29, is omitted, in which it is stated that David marched against Rabbah, 1 Chron. xx. 2, etc. has the appearance of referring to what took place in Jerusalem.

2 Sam. v. 11. And Hiram king of Tyre, sent messengers to David, and cedar-trees, and carpenters, and masons, etc. The word masons is in Hebrew חרר *wall-stone hewers*.

1 Chron. xiv. 1 has חרשי קיר *wall-hewers*, which is indefinite.

2 Sam. vii. 27. Therefore thy servant has found in his heart to pray this prayer unto thee, יְיָ

1 Chron. xvii. 25 לבי is omitted.

2 Sam. x. 4. Wherefore Hanun took David's servants and shaved off the one half of their beards.

1 Chron. xix. 4. And shaved them.

1 Kings ix. 23. These were the chief of the officers that were over Solomon's work, five hundred and fifty which bare rule over the people that wrought in the work.

2 Chron. viii. 10. These were the chief of king Solomon's officers, even two hundred and fifty, that bare rule over the people.

2 Kings xxi. 18. And Manasseh slept with his fathers and was buried *in the garden* of his own house, etc. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 20. And they buried him in his own house.

(e) *Euphemisms* belong here, as in 1 Chron. xix. 4, עַד-הַמִּשְׁלֵּחַ instead of עַד-שְׁתוּתֵיהֶם, 2 Sam. x. 4; and in 1 Chron. xvii. 11, אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֶּעֵךְ, instead of אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִבְּנֶיךָ, 2 Sam. vii. 12.

III. Other deviations relate both to language and matter, but change the sense for the worse. They may be classed as follows.

(a) Alterations which mar the meaning, as 1 Chron. xix. 3, "Are not his servants come unto thee for to search, and to overthrow, and to spy out *the land*," instead of "to search *the city*, and to spy it out, and to overthrow it" 2 Sam. x. 3. The latter is the more correct.

2 Chron. ii. 8. "Send me also cedar-trees, fir-trees, and alnum-trees, out of Lebanon," etc. Here it is plainly intimated that Hiram was to send sandel-wood from Lebanon. But it did not grow there. It came from Ophir, as we learn from 2 Chron. ix. 10, etc., and 1 Kings x. 11. In 1 Kings v. 20, 22, we see that Hiram gives to Solomon from Lebanon only *cedars* and *cypresses*.

2 Chron. ix. 12. "And king Solomon gave to the queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she asked, *beside that which she had brought unto the king*," etc. The clause in italics is thoroughly unsuitable. The corresponding clause in 1 Kings x. 13 is "beside that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty."

2 Chron. xx. 36. "And he joined himself with him to make ships *to go to Tarshish*: and they made the ships in Ezion-gaber." Here the words לִלְכַּת תַּרְשִׁישׁ are an incorrect representation of אֲנִיּוֹת תַּרְשִׁישׁ *ships of Tarshish* in 1 Kings xxii. 48, for the ships built by Jehoshaphat were meant to sail to Ophir, not to Tarshish. Tarshish-ships denote large merchant vessels, which the Chronicle-writer misunderstanding rendered, *to go to Tarshish*.

2 Chron. xxviii. 27, "And they buried him (Ahaz) in the city, even in Jerusalem; but they brought him not into the sepulchres of the kings of Israel," etc. This is contrary to the correct account in 2 Kings xvi. 20, where we find that "Ahaz slept with his fathers, and was buried with his fathers in the city of David."

2 Chron. xxxiii. 15. "He (Manasseh) took away all the altars that he had built in the mount of the house of the Lord, and in Jerusalem, and cast them out of the city." This is con-

trary to the statement in 2 Kings xxiii. 6, 12, where Josiah removes the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of the Lord, and breaks them in pieces.

(b) Exaggerations in numbers. Thus in 1 Chron. xxi. 5 the number of those fit to bear arms in Israel is 1,100,000, and in Judah 470,000. But in 2 Sam. xxiv. 9 the numbers are, Israel 800,000, Judah 500,000. In 2 Chron. xxi. 25 the price of Ornan's threshingfloor is 600 shekels of gold; but in 2 Sam. xxiv. 24, 50 shekels of silver. David slew of the Syrians 7,000 men who fought in chariots, 1 Chron. xix. 18; but in 2 Sam. x. 18 we find 700. At the building of the temple Solomon had 3,600 overseers (2 Chron. ii. 2, 17, 18); but according to 1 Kings v. 30, 3,300. The molten sea held 3,000 baths according to 2 Chron. iv. 5; but only 2,000 according to 1 Kings vii. 26. The ships of Solomon brought from Ophir 450 talents of gold, 2 Chron. viii. 18; but according to 1 Kings ix. 28, only 420 talents.

In 2 Chron. vii. 5 Solomon offered a sacrifice of 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep. Surely these numbers are incredible. As they were offered in seven days we have 5 oxen and 24 sheep every minute, reckoning twelve hours for work. What would be the effect of their smoke and odour on the population of the city?

In 2 Chron. xiv. 8, it is said that Judah had furnished to Asa's army of heavy-armed men 300,000, and Benjamin 280,000. These numbers are incredibly large.

In 2 Chron. xiii. 3, etc., Abijah is said to have had an army of 400,000 chosen men, and Jeroboam of 800,000 men. Of the latter 500,000 were slain.

The height of the porch of the temple given in 2 Chron. iii. 4, viz., 120 cubits is great beyond all proportion; for the height of the main building was only 30 cubits (1 Kings vi. 2). Its breadth was 10 cubits, and therefore its height could not be 130, with the shape it had.

In 1 Chron. xxi. 5 the numbers 1,100,000 and 470,000 neither harmonise with the parallel place in Samuel, nor with the narrative in 1 Chron. xxvii. 1-15; and imply the existence of a standing army amounting to 300,000, which is too large for the population of the country.

In 2 Chron. viii. 11 a gloss is inserted, in the form of words put into the mouth of Solomon, which betrays the negligence of the Chronist. "And Solomon brought up the daughter of Pharaoh, into the house that he had built for her; for he said, My wife shall not dwell in the house of David, king of Israel, because the places are holy whereunto the ark of the Lord hath come." The writer has entirely omitted to notice the building

of Millo; but states the reason for bringing Pharaoh's daughter into the house he had built for her, because the palace of David into which the ark had come was holy, and therefore she could not dwell there. But surely she had lived in the old palace of David till the building of the new house; and, besides, the ark had not been in the palace, *i.e.*, in its court, but *outside* of it.

(c) Mythological alterations and additions.

1 Chron. xxi. 16, "And David lifted up his eyes and saw the angel of the Lord stand between the earth and the heaven, having a drawn sword in his hand stretched out over Jerusalem," etc., ver. 27, "and the Lord commanded the angel, and he put up his sword again into the sheath thereof." Instead of this we have only in 2 Sam. xxiv. 17, "when David saw the angel that smote the people," etc.

1 Chron. xxi. 26, "David called upon the Lord, and He answered him from heaven by fire upon the altar of burnt-offering." This is not in 2 Sam. xxiv.

2 Chron. vii. 1, etc., "When Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt-offering and the sacrifices, . . . and when all the children of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord upon the house, they bowed themselves," etc. There is nothing of this marvel in 1 Kings vii.

Of the same nature is a legendary addition to "Jehoshaphat cried out," viz., *and the Lord helped him; and God moved them to depart from him* (2 Chron. xviii. 31), derived from the traditional interpretation of "cried out," equivalent to *prayer*.¹

VII. SCOPE.—The *scope* of the work bears upon the temple and its worship. The compiler living after the captivity and looking back to the history of his nation before its calamities, was animated with the desire of holding up the mirror of history before his contemporaries, that they might see the close connection between regard for the true worship and national prosperity. He intended to give a brief history of the people under David and his successors the kings of Judah, with chief reference to the efforts for establishing the true religion and exterminating idolatry; that the men of his time who were most efficient in placing ecclesiastical affairs on a firm foundation and restoring the proper worship of Jehovah, might be encouraged. His treatment of the history is regulated to a great extent by the *ecclesiastical* element. Hence we see his endeavours to give copious information about the tribe of Levi, its arrangements, divisions, offices and employments. The Levitical tendency of the book is manifest. Even in the genea-

¹ De Wette, Einleit. p. 269, et seqq., and Movers, Kritische Untersuchungen, u. s. w. p. 199 et seqq.

logical part, where the compiler speaks most fully of the tribe of Judah because David belonged to it, he gives more information concerning Levi than any other. Hastening on to David and the kingdom whose centre was Jerusalem, he cannot pass over Levi so slightly as the other tribes; because the Levitical worship was meant to be a leading topic in his history of Judah.

In accordance with this scope, we find most attention directed to the times in which religion prevailed among the people; and to the men who were most active in purifying the people from idolatry. David, Solomon, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Hezekiah, Josiah, are described at length, in relation to the temple and its appointed ordinances. The tabernacle under David, and the temple with all pertaining to it, the preparations for its building, its erection, dedication, repair, re-opening, and purifying, are dwelt upon. The dark times of prevailing idolatry and the kings who promoted it are rapidly glanced at; as though the writer were reluctant to look at them. Thus the book forms a valuable supplement to the history of the theocracy given in earlier books.

The spirit of the work is *Levitical*. This is only natural because the author himself was a Levite. Besides, the spirit of the time he belonged to was Levitical. The temple had been rebuilt. The old worship had been restored; and the people, awakened to new life, directed their attention to that which reminded them of their former greatness. Long-neglected rites reappeared with a fresh activity that recalled former times. The writer dwells on such parts of the national history as were important and interesting in the eyes of his contemporaries. Ecclesiastical institutions, usages, and ceremonies, are described at length. His standpoint is an *ecclesiastical* one, and therefore the Levites everywhere occupy the foreground, while the prophets are in the distance. There is an absence of prophetic inspiration. And it is remarkable that a title is given to the older prophets which very rarely appears in the other historians—viz., *נָבִיא* or *נְזִיר* *seer* (1 Chron. ix. 22; xxvi. 28; xxix. 29; 2 Chron. ix. 29; xii. 15; xvi. 7; xix. 2). On the contrary the compiler of Kings presents a *prophetic-didactic* one. He devotes a comparatively small space to accounts relating to external worship, and dwells particularly on the cause of the national misfortunes—apostasy of their fathers from the true God. But the Chronist lived at a later period and in different circumstances. He looked back on the earlier history of his nation with feelings of reverence and admiration. It appeared great in his eyes: everything was magnified to him in the distance. Hence he presents it in a favourable light, or passes over the bad lightly.

He would rather set forth the good and the beautiful than the vicious. The past was seen by him and his contemporaries in a brighter light than by the writer of Kings; all the more bright in consequence of the political position of the people. The peculiarities of the compiler of Chronicles can be accounted for in this manner. The religious as well as political state of the nation, the restored worship of God, the feelings natural to those who looked back to a better period of their country's history, the cessation of the prophetic ministry, and the efficacy attributed to the forms of external worship, must have had a peculiar influence on the general view taken by his contemporaries of their history; which view is faithfully reflected by the writer. He represented the prevailing stand-point of his day. One passage will put the writer's Levitical tendency in a prominent manner before the reader. In 2 Chron. xxiii. 1-8 are given the names of some persons engaged by Jehoiada in his conspiracy, and the assembling of the Levites out of all the cities of Judah. The parallel account in 2 Kings xi. does not assign the same distinction to the Levites and priests as the Chronist does. "A third part of you entering on the Sabbath, of the priests and of the Levites, shall be porters of the doors" (2 Chron. xxiii. 4). "Let none come into the house of the Lord, save the priests, and they that minister of the Levites; they shall go in, for they are holy," etc. (ver. 6). "The Levites shall compass the king round about, every man with his weapon in his hand," etc. (7). "The Levites and all Judah," etc. (8). "Jehoiada the priest dismissed not the courses" (8). There is nothing in the parallel passage corresponding to these duties committed to priests and Levites. In like manner, 2 Kings xi. 14 has no such phrase as that in 2 Chron. xxiii. 13, "also the singers with instruments of music, and such as taught to sing praise." "The priest appointed officers over the house of the Lord" (2 Kings xi. 18) may be compared with "Jehoiada appointed the officers of the house of the Lord by the hand of the priests the Levites, whom David had distributed in the house of the Lord, to offer the burnt-offerings of the Lord, as it is written in the law of Moses, with rejoicing and with singing, as it was ordained by David. And he set the porters at the gates of the house of the Lord, that none which was unclean in any thing should enter in" (2 Chron. xxiii. 18, 19).

VIII. APOLOGETIC SPIRIT AND HISTORICAL CREDIBILITY.—The book was compiled in an *apologetic* spirit, the writer having been desirous to present the favourable side of his country's history. Thus in 1 Kings ix. 21 it is said that the children of Israel were not able utterly to destroy the old inhabitants of Canaan; but

in 2 Chron. viii. 8 the statement is softened into "whom the children of Israel destroyed not." Hence many of the bad parts of David's conduct which are honestly related in the books of Samuel and Kings are here omitted. Thus in 2 Sam. vi. 13 it is stated, that David took him more concubines and wives out of Jerusalem; but in 1 Chron. xiv. 3 *concubines* are omitted, and only wives given. It is vain to deny with Bertheau that the former word has not been *purposefully* omitted, because concubines are mentioned in 1 Chron. iii. 9; for in the latter place concubines are merely spoken of in connexion with their sons, to complete a list of David's sons. In relation to the same king's cruelty to the Moabites and Ammonites (2 Sam. viii. 2; xii. 31) the Chronicle-writer breaks off abruptly (1 Chron. xx. 3). He passes over David's adultery and Uriah's murder, as also his surrender of Saul's posterity at the desire of the heathen Gibeonites (2 Sam. xxi. 1-11). The scene between him and Michal (2 Sam. vi. 20-23) is omitted that nothing should be said prejudicial to the king. In the divine message delivered to David by Nathan, the words, "if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men," are omitted, as giving an unfavourable part of the promise (1 Chron. xvii. 13; comp. 2 Sam. vii. 14). In like manner Hezekiah's humble message to Sennacherib to desist, telling him that he would bear whatever the latter should put upon him, the king of Assyria naming 300 talents of silver and thirty talents of gold, is passed over because the writer did not wish to weaken the impression of the wonderful deliverance of Judah by mentioning the misfortunes of Hezekiah in the earlier part of the Assyrian war. And it was not creditable to Hezekiah that in order to pay the sum specified by Sennacherib "he cut off the gold from the doors of the temple of the Lord, and from the pillars which Hezekiah king of Judah had overlaid, and gave it to the king of Assyria" (2 Kings xviii. 14-16; comp. 2 Chron. xxxii. 1). The judgment pronounced by the writer of Kings upon Abijam, "he walked in all the sins of his father, which he had done before him" (1 Kings xv. 3), is omitted in 2 Chron. xiii. 2. In the case of four kings, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham, the formula is suppressed, "howbeit the high places were not taken away: as yet the people did sacrifice and burnt incense on the high places;" although it is appended to them in Kings. It is not mentioned that the brazen serpent was worshipped in Judah till its removal by Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 4). The last two examples shew a tendency in the writer to speak less of the idolatry of the people than preceding historians. It is true that he does not omit to mention it in many places; but it is usually in such a connection as treats of the

reformation of worship and punishment of idolaters. In other cases he evinces a reluctance to speak at length of the prevailing idolatries; and therefore he treats of them very summarily, as in the case of Ahaz (comp. 2 Chron. xxviii. 23 with 2 Kings xvi.), and Josiah (comp. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 33 with 2 Kings xxiii. 4-20). In like manner the section relating to Solomon (1 Kings xi.) where his heathen women, his idolatry, and various unfortunate occurrences of his reign are related, is passed over.

The Levitical and apologetic partialities of the writer appear most plainly in 2 Chron. xxiii. compared with 2 Kings xi. as has been already intimated. His arbitrary alterations of genuine history for the purpose of exalting his order are unmistakeable. The honour due to the Pretorian guards, as we learn from 2 Kings xi. is here given to the Levites, who are represented, very improbably, as having been gathered out of all the cities of Judah by the captains of hundreds. In the fourth and fifth verses of 2 Chron. xxiii., the three divisions of watchmen, with the exception of the second, are converted into *watchmen of the temple*; whereas in 2 Kings xi. 5, 6, they are *watchmen of the king's palace or person*. Nothing can be plainer than the spirit of the Chronicle-writer when he says: "but let none come into the house of the Lord save the priests and they that minister of the Levites: they shall go in, for they are holy." In the parallel passage in Kings, neither the priests nor the Levites appear; but the manner in which all honour is here assigned them harmonises with the general tone of the Chronicles. In conformity with these remarks let 2 Chron. xxiv. 6 be compared with 2 Kings xii. 6-8, and it will be seen how slightly a charge of embezzlement against the Levitical order is noticed—so slightly as to be almost suppressed. In 1 Chron. xviii. 17 we read that "the sons of David were *chief* about the king," instead of *priests*, as in 2 Sam. viii. 18. The Chronicle-writer could endure none but *Levitical* priests. In vain does Movers try to shew that כֹּהֲנִים does not mean priests in 2 Sam. but *servants* or *officers of the court*.¹ The best lexicographers are against him.

Again, the kings of Syria and Israel besieged Ahaz in Jerusalem; but their undertaking completely failed (2 Kings xvi. 5, etc. and Is. vii. 1, 4, 7, viii. 10). To get rid of his enemies the king of Judah sent the treasures of the temple and palace to the king of Assyria, *who helped him*, conquered Damascus, and slew the king of Syria. But according to the Chronicles (2 Chron. xxviii. 5, etc.), Ahaz was delivered into the hand of the

¹ Kritische Untersuchungen, u. s. w. p. 301 et seqq.

king of Syria because he was addicted to idolatry and offered his children to Moloch. A great multitude of the Jews were carried away captive to Damascus; the king of Israel also slew in one day 120,000 valiant men of Judah and took 200,000 prisoners; the Edomites smote Judah and carried away captives; the Philistines invaded the cities of the low country and of the south of Judah; the king of Assyria came to Ahaz and distressed him, on which occasion Ahaz plundered the temple and his palace to send the treasures to the king of Assyria, but the latter *helped him not*. Here it may be *assumed* that *one expedition* of the kings of Syria and Israel is mentioned in Kings; *another* in Chronicles. But neither history contains a hint of two; and it is obvious that the Chronicle-writer passes over the fortunate events of Ahaz's life, making the unfortunate ones as prominent as possible. In any case two expeditions are highly improbable. According to 2 Kings, Ahaz gets a new altar made for the temple, after the pattern of one he had seen at Damascus; causes it to be put in the place of the brazen one before in use, that the high priest might employ it for sacrifice; and takes away various articles out of the temple to purchase the help of the king of Assyria. But on the contrary, according to 2 Chron. xxviii. 22, etc., Ahaz sacrifices to the gods of Damascus in the time of his distress, thinking that they who had smitten him might help him (but they were the ruin of him and all Israel); shuts up the doors of the temple, makes altars in every corner of Jerusalem, and builds high places in every city of Judah to burn incense to strange gods. When he dies he is buried in Jerusalem, but not in the sepulchres of the kings; whereas the books of Kings state that he was buried *with his fathers* in the city of David (2 Kings xvi. 20). Such varying accounts of Ahaz in the Chronicles and Kings can hardly be reconciled, and shew a tendency in the Chronist to pourtray his conduct in the most unfavourable light.

Still farther, the Chronist's account of Manassch is so unlike that given in the Kings, as to excite the attention of the critic and awaken grave doubts of historical fidelity on the part of the former. Two facts are related in Chronicles which are unnoticed in Kings—viz., the captivity of Manassch in Babylon and his consequent return to the Lord (2 Chron. xxxiii.). It cannot be said that the mere silence of the King-writer is of no prejudice to the credit of the Chronist, if it can be shewn that the accounts of the one are irreconcilable with those of the other. His reforming measures, as narrated in 2 Chron. xxxiii., do not hang well together with those of 2 Kings xxi.; for according to the latter, Amon did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, *as his father Manasseh did; he walked in all the way that*

his father walked in ; served the idols that his father served and worshipped them, etc. There is no indication of his having restored the idols which his father had removed, as is said of Manasseh in relation to Hezekiah. When Josiah began his reforms he found idolatry widely spread, just as it is described in 2 Kings xxi. 3, etc. ; whereas it is related in the Chronicles that Manasseh took away the strange gods and the image of Astarte out of the temple, and all the altars that he had built, and cast them out of the city. In agreement with this language, Josiah commanded to be brought out of the temple all the vessels made for Baal, and for Astarte, and for all the host of heaven, and burned them out of Jerusalem ; beating down and destroying the altars which *Manasseh had made in the two courts of the temple*. There is no conceivable, rational explanation for the omission of Manasseh's reforms by the writer of the Kings ; especially as he must have himself lived very near the time. If he did pass them by for some unknown reason, we should expect to find an allusion to them in some contemporary or later prophet, as is the case with regard to other facts described by the Chronist alone. But neither in Zephaniah, nor in Jeremiah, do we find a corroborative hint. The contrary is implied in Jeremiah's language (xv. 4 ; vii. 30, etc. ; xvi. 11, etc.). From a consideration of all the circumstances of the case, we must conclude the alleged reform, and consequently the repentance of Manasseh, to be *unhistorical*. In relation to the captivity of Manasseh in Babylon, some critics who reject the alleged fact of his repentance and reforms, maintain its historical reality ; such as Movers, Thenius, and Bertheau. The silence of the writer of Kings respecting this captivity is very unfavourable to the idea of its actual existence. That so important an event is omitted in those books, and was not found of course in the historical work from which he drew his materials, is calculated to shake our faith in its credibility. Not a hint of it appears in 2 Kings xx. 17, 18, though that is the natural place ; for there the word בְּנֵי־מַנַּסֶּה obviously denotes *posterity*, not *sons proper* of Hezekiah ; and it is contrary to the manner of the compiler of Kings to give a prophecy without its fulfilment. Hence 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11 cannot be the accomplishment of the prediction in 2 Kings xx. 17, 18. The latter was fulfilled in the time of Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel i. 2, etc.). Even the passage in Chronicles does not say that other sons besides Manasseh were carried away into captivity and made eunuchs in the palace at Babylon, or that Manasseh himself filled an office there ; especially as there was no king of Babylon then, according to 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11. Besides, it is related that the king of Assyria took Manasseh to Babylon, instead of to his own capital

to the very city which was then disposed to rebel against him. That is improbable. And who reigned in Jerusalem while Manasseh was prisoner in Babylon? When Jehoaház was carried captive to Egypt by Pharaoh-necho, the latter made Eliakim king in his stead. When Nebuchadnezzar carried away Jehoiachin he made Zedekiah his uncle king in Judah: and when Zedekiah himself was subsequently made captive, Gedaliah became ruler of the land. But when Manasseh was taken away, we hear neither of governor nor king in his stead. Again, there is an indistinctness and generality in the words of Chronicles. "The Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the king of Assyria, which took Manasseh among the thorns, and bound him with fetters and carried him to Babylon." The king of Assyria is not named; the occasion of his making Manasseh captive is omitted; no governor is appointed in his stead. "The Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the king of Assyria." The language is poetical: "they took Manasseh with hooks and bound him with chains and carried him to Babylon" (2 Chron. xxxiii. 11), reminding one of Ezekiel xix. 4, 6, 9, etc. The fact of this captivity seems to have originated in an inference drawn from Isaiah xxxix. 6, 7, and Ezekiel xix. 6, etc.

Movers and Thenius appeal, for evidence of the historical credibility of the fact, to the writer's finding it in the sources whence he drew his materials. In 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18, 19, reference is made to *the book of the kings of Israel* and to *the sayings of the seers* (Hosai) for the acts of Manasseh. But the Chronist was not a mere compiler bound to the historical sources before him; he used them freely and in the manner of his time. The book of the kings of Israel was not very much older than his own work; at all events there was sufficient time between the period of Manasseh and the composition of the Chronicles for the influence of tradition in dressing out the older history, and enlarging it with apocryphal additions.

Many critics, Movers, Keil, Hävernicks, Duncker,¹ Ewald, refer to Ezra iv. 2, and bring Manasseh's captivity into connexion with the statement there made—viz., that Esarhaddon carried away settlers from Babylonia and upper Asia to Samaria, and may on that occasion have subjugated Judah, taking Manasseh prisoner. We cannot perceive the connexion between Esarhaddon's transplanting settlers out of other countries into Samaria, and his undertaking a warlike expedition against Palestine. All that can be inferred from the fact of his removing inhabitants from the eastern parts of his kingdom to

¹ Geschichte d. Alterthüm. II.

Samaria is, that he had previously conquered their people. If it be thought that the testimony of Abydenus (in Eusebius's Chron. Armen.¹), favours a war of Esarhaddon in Palestine when we read that Axerdis got possession of Egypt and the interior parts of Syria (*partesque interiores Syriæ*), it should first be shewn that Axerdis and Esarhaddon are identical, and that the phrase *inner parts of Syria* refers to a conquest of Jerusalem. This is impossible.

On reviewing all the circumstances of the case, it appears to us that the alleged captivity of Manasseh, as well as his repentance, is unhistorical. The carrying away of Jehoiachin and Zedekiah to Babylon, furnished a pattern for the alleged event. It is strange that Thenius and Ewald uphold the credit of the Chronist on this point, though they impugn it so frequently in other places. Movers and Bertheau naturally defend it here. Graf has fully shewn the untenableness of both facts.²

There is no doubt that the Chronicles are inferior to the books of Samuel and Kings in their historical contents. Hence when the accounts are contradictory, the older books are commonly preferable. Perhaps some of his sources were not in all respects trustworthy, and following them he was misled. Tradition had influenced them unfavourably in progress of time; as we know that it is always moulding the history of a nation, more prejudicially in proportion to the length of time which has elapsed since the events narrated took place. Such tradition had affected various parts of the history in the interval between the writer of Kings and the compiler of Chronicles. The latter of course followed it; and his materials suffered in value according to the nature of the tradition acting upon them. Whether he himself derived some things directly from oral tradition is uncertain. In the absence of data, it would be rash to pronounce an opinion. There is no good reason for denying him such liberty, or for thinking it unworthy. But the chief use he made of tradition in its incorporation with written sources was indirect. There he could not separate it, even if he would, from the genuine historical elements; and therefore he related things as he found them already represented. In some instances, the document before him seems to have been unintelligible, and therefore it gave rise to an incorrect statement on the part of the Chronist. Thus in 2 Kings xiv. 7 we read of Amaziah, that he slew of Edom in the valley of Salt, 10,000, and took Selah by war, giving it another name. But in 2 Chron. xxv. 11 we read, that after smiting 10,000 in the valley of Salt, he and his men car-

¹ Page 25, ed. Mai.

² Studien und Kritiken for 1859, p. 467 et seqq.

ried away other 10,000 captives and brought them to the top of the rock, and cast them down headlong from the top of it. Here one is tempted to think, that *the rock* has been made out of Petra or Selah in 2 Kings xiv., and that the 10,000 captives have sprung from the other 10,000; for it is a suspicious circumstance that *the prisoners* should be equal in number to *the slain*.

If it be asked how the compiler employed his sources, the question is difficult to answer. He did not make his extracts from them verbally and slavishly. In other words, he was not a mere copyist or abridger of existing accounts. He must have used them freely and independently. This is apparent from the way in which he has spoken of some things, giving them a turn which they could not have had in his sources, enlarging them with fresh particulars, and impressing upon them his own manner. Such free use of the materials before him indicates a man who did not scruple when he saw fit to carry his own preferences into the domain of his narrative. Thus we read only in 2 Kings that Ahaz "cut off the borders of the bases and removed the laver from off them, and took down the sea from off the brazen oxen that were under it, and put it upon a pavement of stones. And the covert for the sabbath that they had built in the house, and the king's entry without, turned he from the house of the Lord for the king of Assyria." But in 2 Chron. xxviii. 24, it is related that he did worse than this. He gathered together the vessels of the house of God and cut them in pieces, and shut up the doors of the house of the Lord. Here the writer wishes to depict in strong terms Ahaz's hatred against the temple-worship of Jehovah, and his attachment to heathen idols. Both circumstances, his cutting in pieces all the vessels of the temple and closing the doors of the house of Jehovah, can hardly be true, because it is expressly intimated that the worship of God still continued in his reign (2 Kings xvi. 15, etc.), and because it was needless to close up the temple after making altars "in every corner of Jerusalem" for the worship of idols. The Chronist has here intensified his dislike of idolatry by painting Ahaz in very strong lines. In harmony with what has just been said, Ahaz is said in 2 Chron. xxviii. 3, to have burnt *his children* in the fire; whereas, in 2 Kings xvi. 3, we find the singular, *his son*, who also was made to "pass through" the fire: whether *burnt* in it or not is left ambiguous.

The mode in which Jehoiada the priest takes measures for crowning Joash is differently related by the Chronist from that in Kings. By the help of the Levites belonging to all the cities of Judah and the chief of the fathers of Israel the young king was put upon the throne. So the Chronist states. But

the same thing is effected by Jehoiada through the instrumentality of the rulers over hundreds, the captains and the guard, according to the writer of Kings. The Levitical partiality of the Chronicle-writer appears here as elsewhere in altering the account as it stands in Kings (comp. 2 Chron. xxiii. 1-11 with 2 Kings xi. 4-12). These examples may serve to show the general credibility of the accounts contained in the books before us so far as they are parallel with those in Samuel and Kings. The writer usually followed his sources without falsifying them.

It cannot be maintained, however, either that his sources were always as good as those followed by the writer of the Kings, or that he reproduced them so exactly and faithfully. In places where his narrative contradicts the earlier books, it is almost always less reliable. Thus 2 Chron. xx. 36, 37, states that Jehoshaphat joined himself with Ahaziah king of Israel to make ships to go to Tarshish: and they made the ships in Ezion-gaber. But Eliezer prophesied against him for this alliance, predicting the shattering of the ships, which came to pass accordingly. In 1 Kings xxii. 48, 49, it is stated that these ships of Tarshish were made to go to Ophir for gold, but went not, because they were broken at Ezion-gaber. There was no alliance between Jehoshaphat and Ahaziah in the expedition; for when the latter proposed it, Jehoshaphat refused.

In 2 Chron. xxii. 8, etc. it is said that Jehu, when executing judgment upon the house of Ahab, found the princes of Judah and the sons of the brethren of Ahaziah, and slew them. But in 2 Kings x. 13, they are said to be the *brethren of Ahaziah*. In 2 Chron. xxi. 16, 17, all these brethren are represented as carried off by the Philistines and Arabians, except the youngest, Jehoahaz or Ahaziah, which disagrees with 2 Kings viii. 26, xi. 2. And when the Chronicle-writer states that Ahaziah was the *youngest* son of Jehoram, this could hardly be the case. He was twenty-two years old (not forty-two, as stated in 2 Chron. xxii. 2) when he began to reign. His father Jehoram was thirty-two years old when he began to reign (xxi. 20) and reigned eight years. Thus Jehoram is made to beget Ahaziah when he was seventeen years old, and yet he was the youngest of forty-two!

In 2 Chron. xxii. 9, we read that Ahaziah was concealed in Samaria, whence he was brought into the presence of Jehu, and put to death. But 2 Kings ix. 27 relates that he died at Megiddo of a wound received in his chariot. The latter is the correct account.

According to 2 Chron. xi. 20, Rehoboam took Maachah the daughter of Absalom, who bare him Abijah. This agrees with 1 Kings xv. 2. But it does not agree with what the Chronist

elsewhere states, for he says that the name of Abijah's mother was Michaiah, the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah (2 Chron. xiii. 2).

In 2 Chron. xv. 19, we read that there was no war unto the thirty-fifth year of Asa's reign. This is contrary to 1 Kings xv. 16, where it is said that there was war between Asa and Baasha *all their days*. Baasha lived only to the twenty-seventh year of Asa (1 Kings xv. 33).

In 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, we read that Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up against Jehoiakim, and bound him in fetters, to carry him away to Babylon. This does not agree with 2 Kings xxiv. 6, nor with Jeremiah xxii. 18, 19, xxxvi. 30, which obviously knew nothing of his captivity. The infinitive

with lamed לְהוֹלִיכֵו *to lead him*, must mean that Jehoiakim was actually led away, as appears from a comparison of לָבִיא אֹתֵו (Jer. xxxix. 7) with וַיִּבְאֵהוּ (Jer. lii. 11, and 2 Kings xxv. 7). The Chronist probably chose the indefinite expression, because he perceived that his account was inconsistent with the passages in 2 Kings and Jeremiah just specified. This also explains why the death and burial of Jehoiakim are omitted by the Chronist, contrary to his usual manner. The alleged fact of Jehoiakim's captivity seems to have arisen from confounding him with Jehoiachin. Those who reconcile the fact of Jehoiakim's being carried away to Babylon (Chronicles), with his death and burial at or in Jerusalem (Kings and Jeremiah), suppose that he returned from captivity and assumed the reins of government in Jerusalem as a vassal of the Chaldeans, drawing upon their imagination for this, since the Chronicles do not hint at a return.

According to 2 Kings xvi. 5, etc., the kings of Assyria and Israel march against Ahaz and besiege him in Jerusalem; but they *could not overcome him*. In order to free himself from his enemies, the king of Judah sends the treasures of the temple and of his palace to the king of Assyria *who helps him*, conquers Damascus, and kills the king of Syria. But 2 Chron. xxviii. 5, etc., makes Ahaz to be delivered up to the king of Syria who carries away a great multitude captive to Damascus; the Edomites smite Judah and carry away captives; the Philistines invade the cities of the low country and the south of Judah; the king of Assyria comes against Ahaz and distresses him, in consequence of which the latter plunders the temple and his palace to send the treasures to the king of Assyria, who, however, *helps him not*. Here the discrepancy is apparent if, *as is most probable*, both writers refer to the same events in the life of Ahaz. But many critics make two different campaigns of the kings of Syria and Israel against Ahaz, though neither speaks of a *con-*

paign. They differ of course in settling whether the Chronicles speak of the earlier or later one. We agree with Caspari,¹ that both treat of the same expedition, though not with his settlement of the order of events, nor with that of Bertheau. One expedition and one time seems to be intended, and therefore the narratives do not harmonise. What favours their identity is the circumstance that, if the Chronist speaks of one campaign and the writer of Kings of another, the former presents nothing but disastrous events in the history of Ahaz, omitting the prosperous ones; while, on the contrary, the latter purposely omits the unfortunate things in that monarch's reign, and narrates none but the successful. It is highly improbable that the respective writers confined themselves to one side of the picture. To assume it is to prejudice the historical character of both.

The Chronist's love of the marvellous appears very conspicuously in 2 Chron. xx. 1-30, in which the destruction of the Moabites and their allies is recorded. According to the declaration of a prophet, Jehoshaphat and his people would only have to stand still and not fight. "The Lord set ambushments against the children of Ammon, Moab, and mount Seir, which were come against Judah. And they were smitten. For the children of Ammon and Moab stood up against the inhabitants of mount Seir, utterly to slay and destroy them, and when they had made an end of the inhabitants of Seir, every one helped to destroy another." Thus the enemies of Judah exterminated one another, so that the whole plain was covered with dead bodies, and not one escaped. The word translated *ambushments* means *powers* or *angels* commissioned by God to bring about the destruction of the army. Of course this cannot be true history.

It speaks favourably on behalf of the Chronist's *general* fidelity that he has in some cases given two different accounts of the same thing which he found in his sources; as in 1 Chron. xxiii. 24-32, compared with xxiii. 3, it being stated in the one case that the Levites were to do service in the house of the Lord from twenty years of age and upwards; in the other, from thirty. The twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth verses show why David departed from the legal number thirty; and therefore there is no ground for endeavouring to find some method of reconciling the varying statements. Both numbers are given as the compiler found them.

The historical character of the book has been most impugned in the materials which are peculiar to themselves. Here the Levitical bias of the writer appears very strongly, impregnating them with improbable particulars. But it should always be recollected

¹ Ueber den Syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg unter Jotham und Ahas, p. 28, et seqq.

that the author being himself a Levite, and taking a post-exile view of the public worship of Jehovah, brings before the reader arrangements connected with divine service in the temple: that he was a native of Judah—which was much less addicted to idolatry than Israel—and that pious kings who manifested right-minded zeal for the glory of God are commended; while the ruinous consequences of idolatrous practices are shewn. The *general* credibility of the writer's communications may be safely asserted. In many cases they can be confirmed by independent testimony. Thus the victory of Asa over the Ethiopians under Zerah is described in a manner accordant with the historical relations of ancient Egypt. The Ethiopians marched from Egypt, and thither they went back. Accordingly it may be inferred that this Ethiopian king possessed Egypt, and therefore his territory extended near the borders of Palestine. Herodotus relates that several of the Egyptian kings were Ethiopians. The successive and minute details in the narrative are such as bear the stamp of historical truth, not of fiction. Thus it is said that Zerah came with an immense army as far as Maresha. There in a valley called Zephathah, Asa went forth to meet the Ethiopian, whom he smote and pursued as far as Gerar on the Egyptian border. He also destroyed all the cities round about Gerar, and found in them very much spoil. With that spoil, consisting of sheep, oxen, and camels, in abundance, he returned to Jerusalem; where in the third month of the fifteenth year of Asa's reign, a thank-offering of it was presented unto the Lord, 700 oxen and 7,000 sheep. And it is expressly stated that the strangers out of Ephraim and Manasseh, as well as out of Simeon, came to the festivity, which agrees with 1 Kings xv. 17.

The invasion of Jerusalem by the Philistines and Arabians in the reign of Jehoram (2 Chron. xxi. 16, 19) is confirmed by Joel iv. 5, 6. The Chronist relates that they carried away all the substance that was found in the king's house, and his sons and his wives. Although it is not said that they plundered Jerusalem, the thing is plainly implied. To this Joel alludes: "Because ye have taken my silver and my gold, and have carried into your temples my goodly pleasant things."

The wars of Uzziah and Ahaz against the Philistines, as described in 2 Chron. xxvi. 6, and xxviii. 18 agree with Is. xiv. 28, etc., and Amos vi. 2. The Chronist mentions the important buildings which Uzziah and Jotham undertook (2 Chron. xxvi. 6, 9; xxvii. 4): so does the prophet Hosea (viii. 14). In 2 Chron. xxxii. 3-5 the measures taken by Hezekiah to strengthen Jerusalem against Sennacherib are described. He stopped the fountains without the city and the brook (Kedron). The same thing

is described by Is. xxii. 9, 11. He built up all the wall that was broken, 2 Chron. xxxii. 5. This is referred to in Is. xxii. 9. He made darts and shields in abundance, 2 Chron. xxxii. 5. This is expressed in Isaiah by the words, "Thou didst look in that day to the armour of the house of the forest" (Is. xxii. 8).

The examples now given create a favourable impression in the reader's mind of the fidelity of the Chronist in the sections and particulars peculiar to himself. Yet it must not be concealed that there are serious suspicions against his accuracy in all places. As it would be foolish to doubt his exactness wherever he narrates something new; so it would be hazardous to assert his universal trustworthiness in such places. The latter, we believe, cannot be supported any more than the former. Customs and usages established in the time of the writer are sometimes transferred to an earlier period. Thus in 1 Chron. xvi. a psalm of praise is represented as sung by David's order, which was not then extant in its present state. The parts of it are found scattered through various psalms. Verses 8-22 are from cv. at the commencement. Verses 23-33 are from xevi. Verses 34-36 are from the close of cvi. The verbal differences are not very great, nor can the text of the one be well corrected by that of the other source. Two suppositions are possible, viz., that the poem as it appears in Chronicles is the original of cv., xevi., and also of cvi. 1, 47, 48. This is the view taken by Hitzig, who thinks that the Chronicle-writer composed it with the help of some earlier psalms.¹ In favour of this, it may be said that the text in Chronicles contains the earlier and original readings; but that admits of exceptions, though as a whole the text is certainly the more original one. Another hypothesis is, that the psalm as it is now was made by the church out of others well known, for liturgical use. Whether the Chronist himself did so, or whether it was in use before his time, is uncertain. In either case no critic pretends that either the psalm in Chronicles, or those from which it was made, was as early as the time of David.

In the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth chapters of 1 Chron. it is not difficult to see that the historical materials have been very freely elaborated after such late views as prevailed in the writer's time. The main facts are certainly historical, viz., that David had made preparations for building the temple, and had given to Solomon the exact plan of it, as well as many definite injunctions respecting the carrying out of the plan, and the making of the holy vessels. But a good deal of the adventitious is associated with the historical basis. David's solemn addresses

¹ Die Psalmen, u. s. w. vol. ii. p. 160.

in both chapters are but the drapery in which the writer has clothed certain ideas and facts. It has often been suspected that in the list of the Levites, the courses of the priests, the singers, and officers of the Levites minutely described in 1 Chron. xxiii.-xxvi. later arrangements and names appear; so that more is attributed to David's organization than what actually belonged to it. Every critical reader must allow that such suspicions are well founded; since the evidences of unhistoricalness in the accounts are plain. It is true that many particulars are given in a very uncertain way by the Chronist, so that we are doubtful respecting their intention and scope; but enough appears to justify the assertion that the organisation of priests and Levites assigned to David cannot be looked upon as exact. Thus the collective positions assigned to the porters did not then exist as a whole; for the west side of the temple seems to have had no door *before* the captivity any more than it had *after* it; and adult grandsons of Obed-Edom, David's contemporary, are represented among the porters separated to the office by David (1 Chron. xxvi.). It is also observable that the writer speaks of 24 head porters (1 Chron. xxvi. 17-19) and 4000 porters in a way which, compared with a variety of circumstances mentioned in his work, shews that he distributed the 4000 among the 24, so as to have 167 for each, *i.e.* 24 for each day of the week under every head porter. The Chronist has a partiality for the number 24. In the present instance it has been shewn by Herzfeld¹ that in his day there were only 19 divisions of porters, to which he annexed five additional ones out of the family of Obed-Edom. Thus too, 24,000 Levitical overseers are assigned to the time of David (1 Chron. xxiii. 3), and twelve times 24,000 Israelites attributed to his service on the same arbitrary principle. We must therefore hold that the compiler has taken post-exile arrangements relating to the priests and Levites, and transferred them to the time of David; not indeed in the form in which they existed in his own day, but in a form partly of his own invention. By mingling fiction with reality he made out a system suitable, as he supposed, to the regal wisdom of David.

We have already seen the writer's partiality for genealogies, so that he gave some twice. The same tendency to repetition appears in the historical parts, where perhaps we may find inadvertency rather than design. Thus 2 Chron. i. 14-17 reappears in ix. 25-28; and 2 Chron. ii. 1 in ii. 17. In both instances the latter are their true places. It would be rash to found on these few cases a charge of negligence; though a *very*

¹ Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. i. p. 387 et seqq.

careful writer would hardly have repeated himself in the manner indicated.

IX. STATE OF THE TEXT.—The state of the text in Chronicles is closely connected with the judgment which may be pronounced on the nature of the contents. If the text be regarded as exceedingly corrupt, some of the contradictions and difficulties which appear in the narratives may be easily removed. But if the text be taken as it is and adhered to, inaccuracy will often lie at the door of the writer. We believe that the text *is* more corrupt than that of any other sacred book. Transcribers have made more mistakes in copying it. The reasons are perhaps not very remote. Wherever numerous proper names occur, there is greater liability to err. So with regard to numbers; for letters alike in shape being used as numerals, were easily interchanged.

The following variations in the orthography of names occur in the first eleven chapters. Most of them perhaps originated with transcribers. Some did not.

דִּפְת i. 6	...	רִיפָת Gen. x. 3
תְּרִשִׁישָׁה i. 7	...	תְּרִשִׁיש Gen. x. 4
רֹדְנִים i. 7	...	דֹּרְנִים Gen. x. 4
מִשְׁךָ i. 17	...	מֶשֶׁש Gen. x. 23
עִיבֵל i. 22	...	עֹבֵל Gen. x. 28
יְעוֹשׁ i. 35	...	יְעִיש Gen. xxxvi. 5
צָפִי i. 36	...	צָפו Gen. xxxvi. 11
הוֹמָם i. 39	...	הִימָם Gen. xxxvi. 22
עֲלִין i. 40	...	עֲלוֹן Gen. xxxvi. 23
שָׁפִי i. 40	...	שָׁפו Gen. xxxvi. 23
חֶמֶן i. 41	...	חֶמֶן Gen. xxxvi. 26
יַעֲקֹן i. 42	...	יַעֲקֹן Gen. xxxvi. 27
עֵיֹת 1, 46	...	עֵיֹת Gen. xxxvi. 35
הֶדֶד i. 50	...	הֶדֶד Gen. xxxvi. 39
פָּעִי i. 50...	...	פָּעִי Gen. xxxvi. 39
עֲלִיהָ i. 51	...	עֲלִיהָ Gen. xxxvi. 40
זִמְרִי ii. 6...	...	זִמְרִי Josh. vii. 1, 17, 18
כְּלָבִי ii. 9	...	כְּלָב 1 Chron. ii. 18
שִׁמְעָא ii. 13	...	שִׁמְעָא 1 Sam. xvi. 9
יֵתֶר הַשִּׁמְעֹנִי ii. 17	...	יֵתֶר הַשִּׁמְעֹנִי 2 Sam. xvii. 25

רניאל iii. 1	כלאב 2 Sam. iii. 3
שמעא iii. 5	שמוע 2 Sam. v. 14
עמיאל iii. 5	אליעם 2 Sam. xi. 3
אלישמע iii. 6	אלישוע 2 Sam. v. 15
אלידע iii. 8	בעלירע 1 Chron. xiv. 7
בת-שוע iii. 5	בת-שבע 2 Sam. xi. 3
נמואל iv. 24; Num. xxvi. 12	ימואל Gen. xlvi. 10; Ex. vi. 15
יריב iv. 24	ימין Num. xxvi. 12
זרח iv. 24	צחר Gen. xlvi. 10
בלהה iv. 29	בלה Josh. xix. 3
תולד iv. 29	אלתולד Josh. xix. 4
בתואל iv. 30	בתול Josh. xix. 4
חצר סוסים iv. 31	חצר סוסה Josh. xix. 5
בית בראי iv. 31	בית לבאות Josh. xix. 6
שערים iv. 31	שרוחן Josh. xix. 6
עיטם iv. 32	עטר Josh. xix. 7
לבני vi. 2	לעדן 1 Chron. xxiii. 7, 8
יחא vi. 5	יחיאל 1 Chron. xxiii. 8
עדו vi. 6	עדיה 1 Chron. vi. 26
יאתרי vi. 6	אתני 1 Chron. vi. 26
שאול vi. 9	יואל 1 Chron. vi. 21
עזיה vi. 9	עזריה 1 Chron. vi. 21
אחימות vi. 10	מחת 1 Chron. vi. 20
צופי vi. 11	צוף vi. 20. צוף 1 Sam. i. 1
נחת vi. 11	תוח vi. 19. תחו 1 Sam. i. 1
אליאב vi. 12	אליהו vi. 19. אליהו 1 Sam. i. 1
חילן vi. 43	חלן Josh. xxi. 15; comp. xv. 51
עשן vi. 44	עין Josh. xxi. 16
עלמת vi. 45	עלמון Josh. xxi. 18
יקמעם vi. 53	קבצים Josh. xxi. 22
את-ענר vi. 55	את-תענק Josh. xxi. 25
גולן vi. 56	גלון Josh. xxi. 27
עשתרות vi. 56	בעשתרה Josh. xxi. 27
קדש vi. 57	קשיון Josh. xxi. 28

ראמות vi. 58...	ירמות Josh. xxi. 29
ענם vi. 58	עין-גנים Josh. xxi. 29
משל vi. 59	משאל Josh. xxi. 30
חוקק vi. 60	חלקת Josh. xxi. 31
חמון vi. 61	חמת דאר Josh. xxi. 32
קריתים vi. 61	קרתן Josh. xxi. 32
רמונו vi. 62	רמנה Josh. xxi. 35
ראמות vi. 65...	רמת Josh. xix. 21
פואה vii. 1	פוא Gen. xlv. 13; Num. xxvi. 23
ישיב vii. 1	יוב Num. xxvi. 24. Gen. xlv. 13
שלום vii. 13	שלם Gen. xlv. 24; Num. xxvi. 49
ברד vii. 20	בכר Num. xxvi. 35
תחת vii. 20	תחן Num. xxvi. 35
שומר vii. 32	שמר 1 Chron. vii. 34
אחרח viii. 1	אחירם Num. xxvi. 38
אדר viii. 3	אדר Gen. xlv. 21
שפופן viii. 5	שפופם Num. xxvi. 39. שפם 1 Chron. vii. 12. מפים Gen. xlv. 21
שמאה viii. 32	שמאם 1 Chron. ix. 38
יהועדה viii. 36	יערה 1 Chron. ix. 42
תארע viii. 35...	תחרע 1 Chron. ix. 41
רפה viii. 37	רפיה 1 Chron. ix. 43
עותי ix. 4	עתיה Neh. xi. 4
עשיה ix. 5	מעשיה Neh. xi. 5
יחורה ix. 12	אחוי Neh. xi. 13
בקבקר ix. 15...	בקבקיה Neh. xi. 17
זכרי ix. 15	זכדי Neh. xi. 17
עבדיה ix. 16	עבדא Neh. xi. 17
שמעיה ix. 16...	שמוע Neh. xi. 17
יעואל ix. 35	אביאל 1 Sam. ix. 1
דודו xi. 12	דודי 1 Chron. xxvii. 4
האחוחי xi. 12	בן אחחי 2 Sam. xxiii. 9

חכמוני xi. 11... ..	2 Sam. xxiii. 8
עורד את-חניתו xi, 11	עדינו העצנו 2 Sam. xxiii. 8
איש-חיל xi. 22	איש חי 2 Sam. xxiii. 20
שמות ההרורי xi. 27	שמה החרדי 2 Sam. xxiii. 25
הפלוגי xi. 27... ..	הפלטי 2 Sam. xxiii. 26
סבכי xi. 29	מבני 2 Sam. xxiii. 27
עילי xi. 29	צלמן 2 Sam. xxiii. 28
חלד xi. 30	חלב 2 Sam. xxiii. 29
חורי xi. 32	הדי 2 Sam. xxiii. 30
אביאל xi. 32.	אבי עלבון 2 Sam. xxiii. 31
הבחרומי xi. 33	הברחמי 2 Sam. xxiii. 31
בני השם הגווי יונתן בן-שגא הררי xi. 34, "The sons of Hashem the Gizonite, Jona- than the son of Shage the Hararite."	ישן יהונתן שמה החררי 2 Sam. xxiii. 32, 33, "The sons of Jashen, Jonathan, Shammah the Hararite."
שכר xi. 35	שרר 2 Sam. xxiii. 33
אליפל בן אור : הפר המכרתי 1 Chron. xi. 35, 36, "Eli- phal the son of Ur, Hephher the Mecherathite."	אליפל בן-אחסבי בן המעכתי 2 Sam. xxiii. 34, "Eliphelet the son of Ahasbai, the son of the Maachathite."
אחיה הפלגי xi. 36	אליעם בן אחיתפל הגלגי 2 Sam. xxiii. 34
נערי בן אזבי xi. 37	פערי הארבי 2 Sam. xxiii. 35
יואל אחי נתן xi. 38, "Joel the brother of Nathan."	יגאל בן נתן 2 Sam. xxiii. 36, "Igal the son of Nathan."
מבחר בן הגרי xi. 38, "Mibhar the son of Haggeri."	בני הגרי 2 Sam. xxiii. 36, "Bani the Gadite."

In the historical part similar variations occur, though they are by no means so frequent or extensive ; as,

הדר עזר 1 Chron. xviii. 3, 5, 7, 8	הדר עזר 2 Sam. viii. 3, etc.
מבחת 1 Chron. xviii. 8	בטח 2 Sam. viii. 8
תע 1 Chron. xviii. 9	תעי 2 Sam. viii. 9
הדרום 1 Chron. xviii. 10	2-יורם 2 Sam. viii. 10

ספי 1 Chron. xx. 4	ספ 2 Sam. xxi. 18
ארנן 1 Chron. xxi. 15	אורנה 2 Sam. xxiv. 16
שבואל 1 Chron. xxiii. 16	שובאל 1 Chron. xxv. 4
שלמית 1 Chron. xxiii. 18	שלמות 1 Chron. xxiv. 22
צדרתה 2 Chron. iv. 17	צרתן 1 Kings vii. 46
עבדן 2 Chron. xxxiv. 20	עכבור 2 Kings xxii. 12
עזריהו 2 Chron. xxii. 6	אחזיהו 2 Kings viii. 29

In determining whether either parallel text in these instances is corrupt, and if so which is the original, as well as in the mode of rectifying the corruption, the critic feels great difficulty ; because it is impossible to avoid taking into the question antecedent feelings respecting the general character and comparative accuracy of the respective writers. Letters having been used as numerals in ancient times, one letter was often mistaken for another by transcribers, and hence many corruptions got into the text. The following list will shew that the specification of numbers must sometimes be rectified in the text of the Chronicles. Not that the parallel numbers in Samuel and Kings are always right. On the contrary, those in the Chronicles are sometimes right when *they* are wrong. An example of this appears in 2 Chron. ii. 17, where the overseers of Solomon appointed to superintend the work-people in the stone quarries and on Lebanon, is given 3,600 ; whereas in 1 Kings v. 16, it is 3,300. The former allows of one overseer for every fifty men ; the whole number being 180,000. The latter does not harmonise with the proportion of one to fifty.¹ In every case the probabilities in favour of the number in Chronicles, or in the corresponding passage in other historical books, should be carefully weighed, and a judgment be made accordingly. We shall merely indicate the differences, without pointing out in the individual cases which number is right. And it ought to be remarked, that all the numbers given should not be pronounced corrupt or attributed to transcribers. We believe that not a few of them are *now* as they were *at first* ; even though they seem incredibly large, or are opposed to the corresponding numbers elsewhere. It is easy to explain away their largeness by assuming that there has been an error in transcription ; but this proceeds on an *a priori* theory of inspiration which is baseless, having none other ground in its favour than *the wish* of him who would persuade himself that the minutest points in the

¹ See Bunsen's Bibelwerk. Erste Abtheilung, zweyter Theil, p. 216.

Bible history were infallibly correct as they came from the inspired authors.

What we wish to convey to the reader by the following list of discrepant numbers is the fact, that there are some corruptions in the text of the Chronicles where numbers are given.

Jair had 23 cities in Gilead (1 Chron. ii. 23).

He had 30 cities (Judges x. 4).

Jashobeam, one of David's mighty men, slew 300 at one time (1 Chron. xi. 11).

Jashobeam slew 800 (2 Sam. xxiii. 8).

The famine proposed by Gad to David is said to have lasted three years (1 Chron. xxi. 12).

It lasted seven years according to 2 Sam. xxiv. 13.

When David numbered the people Judah had 470,000 men (1 Chron. xxi. 5).

Judah had 500,000 according to 2 Sam. xxiv. 9.

Solomon had 4,000 stalls (2 Chron. ix. 25).

He had 40,000 according to 1 Kings iv. 26.

Jehoiachin was eight years old when he became king (2 Chron. xxxvi. 9).

He was eighteen years old according to 2 Kings xxiv. 8.

David slew of the flying Aramaeans 7,000 men who fought in chariots (1 Chron. xix. 18).

He slew 700 according to 2 Sam. x. 18.

The sum of the people numbered under David amounted to 1,100,000 (1 Chron. xxi. 5).

It amounted to 800,000 according to 2 Sam. xxiv. 9.

David bought the threshing-floor of Ornan for 600 shekels of gold (1 Chron. xxi. 25).

He gave for it 50 shekels of silver according to 2 Sam. xxiv. 24.

At the building of the temple Solomon had 3,600 overseers (2 Chron. ii. 2).

He had 3,300 overseers according to 1 Kings v. 16.

The brazen sea contained 3,000 baths (2 Chron. iv. 5).

It contained 2,000 baths according to 1 Kings vii. 26.

The ships of Solomon brought from Ophir 450 talents of gold (2 Chron. viii. 18).

They brought 420 talents according to 1 Kings ix. 28.

Ahaziah was forty-two years old when he began to reign (2 Chron. xxii. 2).

He was twenty-two years old according to 2 Kings viii. 26.

According to 1 Chron. xxii. 14, David gave for the building of the temple 100,000 talents of gold (500,000,000*l.*), and 1,000,000 talents of silver (353,000,000*l.*). Besides according to xxix. 4, he gave out of his private purse 3,000 talents of gold of Ophir (21,600,000*l.*) and 700 talents of silver. The nobles of the kingdom also gave 5,000 talents of gold, and 10,000 drams (darics), 10,000 talents of silver, 18,000 talents of brass,

100,000 talents of iron (xxix. 7). These added together make an incredibly large sum, which Reinke reduces by conjecturing that letters representing smaller numbers were exchanged for others signifying the present large ones. Keil makes arbitrary assumptions for the same purpose. It is impossible to take the numbers in their literality: they are exaggerated and hyperbolic, like the loose language employed by persons who talk extravagantly of thousands of pounds, without thinking of the true value of numbers.

A similar example occurs in 2 Chron. xvii. 14, etc., where Jehoshaphat king of Judah is said to have had an army of 1,160,000 men, while Adnah the chief had 300,000; Jehohanan the next to him, 280,000; Amasiah, 200,000; Eliada, 200,000; Jehozabad, 180,000. Besides these, the king put numbers in the defended cities throughout all Judah. In this instance corruption is again assumed.

A third example of the same kind is in 2 Chron. xiii. 3, 17, where Abijah led forth to battle 400,000 men, and Jeroboam, king of Israel, 800,000. 500,000 are said to have fallen. The kingdoms of Judah and Israel could scarcely have contained so many fighting men; nor could so many have been slain in one battle.

A similar example is in 2 Chron. xxviii. 6, 8, where Pekah, king of Israel, is said to have slain 120,000 men in one day, and to have carried away captive 200,000 women and children, into Samaria.

The causes of corruption have been more manifestly and extensively in operation in the text of the Chronicles than perhaps in the text of any other Old Testament book. Thus much may be safely allowed; and we believe that the specimens given contribute to render the opinion probable. At the same time, we cannot adopt the view of those critics who act in relation to the text of Chronicles the part of out-and-out-apologists, having recourse to the hypothesis of corruption to account for every difficult or improbable phenomenon, that occurs. The most conspicuous of these apologists in the department of numbers is Reinke.¹ Movers goes too far in the same direction, and even Bertheau. Why should transcribers and others have been so very careless or unskilful in the books of Chronicles compared with the other Scriptures? Why should corruptions be accumulated there and not elsewhere? Is it not an obvious improbability that there should be a very great disproportion between the corruptions in Chronicles and in the other books? The assumption that there is an error in the text wherever there

¹ Beiträge zur Erklärung des alten Testaments, Abhandlung i.

is something inexplicable, improbable, or exaggerated, implies a certain theory of inspiration which unphilosophically overrides existing phenomena, instead of being exclusively derived from them in the only shape they indicate. It is very common for such as claim to be conservative in theology to violate the known principles of criticism by meddling with the text when it stands in the way of their prepossessions. Professing to be very orthodox on the subject of inspiration (though it is better to be *Scriptural* than orthodox), they are heterodox on the subject of the text which lies at the basis of all theology.

X. DATE AND AUTHOR. — 1. The history contained in the work is brought down to the termination of the exile in Babylon, when Cyrus issued a decree encouraging the Jews to return and rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. This may be assigned to the year 535 B.C. And there are marks of a still later age. Thus in 1 Chron. iii. 19-24, the genealogy of the sons of Zerubbabel appears to be carried down to the third generation. Shemaiah the son of Shechaniah was contemporary with Nehemiah (Neh. iii. 29). One of the sons of Shemaiah was Neariah, one of Neariah's three sons was Elioenai, and Elioenai's seven sons are enumerated. In this manner the genealogy comes down to nearly 300 B.C. or at least to 330. We admit that the list is by no means easy of explanation. It is far from being clear, and hence it has been variously interpreted. According to R. Benjamin and the LXX. there are nine descents from Jesaiah (ver. 21) to Johanan, so that the history reaches to 270 B.C. Zunz's calculation (260 B.C.) amounts to nearly the same time.¹ Ewald again reckons the succession from Zerubbabel as containing about six generations, viz., 1. Zerubbabel. 2. Hananiah. 3. Shechaniah. 4. Shemaiah. 5. Neariah. 6. Elioenai. 7. Hodaiah. He assumes from 150-200 years after Zerubbabel and Joshua, and so obtains the termination of the Persian dynasty or the beginning of the Grecian, *i.e.*, 330-320 B.C.² This coincides with the date already given.

But notwithstanding our probable calculation founded on such view of the genealogical register as appears most natural, there are modes of bringing it within the period defined by Hengstenberg and Hävernick as the antecanonical one, *i.e.*, 400 B.C. Both Movers and Hävernick contrive to make the writer of Chronicles a younger contemporary of Nehemiah by assuming that the genealogy stops with Hananiah's two sons, Pelatiah and Jesaiah; the author appending to these names single individuals of David's posterity. It is supposed that after those grandsons of Zerubbabel there is another *parallel* genealogy of

¹ Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, p. 31.

² Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. i. pp. 229, 230.

returned exiles, whose relation to Zerubbabel is not stated. Shemaiah, a contemporary of Zerubbabel, as is conjectured, has his family register carried down four degrees; as far as his first grandsons. Hence those critics bring the register to about 400 B.C.¹ The view given is very ingenious. But it is more ingenious than correct; for it is tolerably clear from Neh. iii. 29 that Shemaiah was not the contemporary of Zerubbabel but of Nehemiah; and if he were so, he lived ninety years later than Zerubbabel. Movers and Hävernick put him somewhere about 530, that is in Zerubbabel's time; but he must, as a contemporary of Nehemiah, be placed about 440 B.C. The explanation of these two scholars would not readily suggest itself to the reader of 1 Chron. iii. 21. Surely it is most natural to carry forward the genealogy there, just as it is continued in the preceding and subsequent verses; even though the mode of expression be varied.

Another way of disposing of the genealogy in order that it may not interfere with a late date of the Chronicles, is by assuming its posterior origin. It did not proceed from the author of Chronicles, but was subsequently inserted by another hand. How arbitrary this hypothesis is, we need not indicate. It disposes of a difficulty very conveniently, and that is all. There is not the least ground for it. It should therefore be as summarily dismissed as it is advanced; though sanctioned by the respectable names of Vitringa, Heidegger, Carpzov, and, apparently Keil.

2. The employment of a word which has been thought to mean *Darics* (1 Chron. xxix. 7) introduced by the compiler into the history of David, shews that he wrote at a time when the name and use of the coin had become familiar. If the term really mean *Darics*, as Gesenius and others think, it brings us far down into the Persian period. Others incline to the opinion of Ewald, who supposes the word in question to be merely the Greek *δραχμή*; if so, the writer must have lived after Alexander the Great, when Greek money became current. The term *בֵּית־הַמִּקְדָּשׁ* meaning a *palace* or *temple* (1 Chron. xxix. 1, 19) does not necessarily limit the time to the Persian dynasty. It is used in Nehemiah, Esther, and Daniel.

3. It is commonly admitted that Ezra and Nehemiah originally formed one work. And we shall shew that the book of Ezra was connected at first with the Chronicles; so that all three belonged to the same compilation. If this be so, the notices bearing on the time of composition of the Chronicles found in Ezra and Nehemiah are legitimate. In Nehemiah xii. 11 Jad-

¹ See Movers' *Kritische Untersuchungen ueber der biblische Chronik*, pp. 29, 30; and Hävernick's *Einleitung* II. i. p. 266 et seqq.

dua is the last in the list given of high priests. He lived in the time of Alexander the Great. The line is carried down no farther; and therefore we may presume that he was contemporary with the compiler of the book of Nehemiah. Again, compositions of Ezra and Nehemiah were used by the compiler of the works called after them; whence it may be inferred that the compiler lived a considerable time posterior to those writers. Besides, he speaks of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah as one long past (Neh. xii. 26, 47). The manner too in which Cyrus and his successors are constantly called "*Persian kings*," shews that the Greek dynasty had begun (Ezra i. 1; iv. 5). Thus the earlier part of the Greek dominion is the probable date.

4. The orthography, style, and language point to a very late period. The Hebrew tongue had greatly degenerated, and was nearly dead. The style of the book betrays a want of skill and aptitude in the use of words, like what is observable in Daniel. In the use of Aramæan forms and later expressions, the compiler must be placed by the side of Esther and Ecclesiastes.

5. Its position in the list of canonical books favours its late origin. It is true that they are not arranged in chronological order; but how can we account for Chronicles being put last of all, among the Hagiographa, on the supposition that the book was written before the last prophet died, or the canon was finally closed by Ezra and his contemporaries, as some believe? Why was it not placed among the historical books, after those of the Kings for example? Why was it not put among the earlier *prophetical* books in the Jewish sense of that epithet; that is, where Samuel and Kings are disposed.

On the whole, we are compelled by all internal evidence to place the compilation of Chronicles much later than Josephus's date for the close of the canon (424 B.C.); or even 400, where Movers is desirous to fix it. It comes nearer to 300 than 400 B.C. This fact will be clear to any one who examines the whole work carefully and closely, comparing it with the books of Samuel and Kings, as also with Nehemiah. But it may escape the superficial reader who is acquainted with nothing more than the English version, and even with that imperfectly. Accordingly the best judges of Hebrew history and diction, Gesenius, Bertholdt, Gramberg, De Wette, Ewald, Zunz, Bertheau, all bring it down later than 400 B.C. And we presume that the opinion of such men is immeasurably superior in value, on such a subject, to that of Dahler, Keil, Movers, Welte, and Hävernick.

The name of the compiler is unknown. De Wette thinks that he belonged to the priests. Rather does he seem to have been one of the singers in the temple at Jerusalem; for he

speaks much of them and the porters, shewing a minute acquaintance with their employments and position. His official character led him to collect with care all accounts relating to the Levites, and to speak at length of them wherever there was an opportunity. The *Levitical* inclination is much more prominent than the *priestly*; and therefore Ewald is right in supposing that he was a Levitical musician.¹

Many have regarded Ezra as the author. This opinion was held by various Rabbins, ecclesiastical fathers, and older theologians. In more modern times it was advocated by Pareau, Eichhorn, and Keil. In favour of it the last-named critic adduces the identity of the termination of the Chronicles with the commencement of Ezra.² Here however it is assumed that Ezra wrote the book which bears his name—a view which is decidedly wrong, as will be shewn hereafter. The great similarity of diction is also adduced in favour of identity of authorship. This is correct, but proves nothing for Ezra's authorship. The same remark applies to the argument derived from the frequent citation of the law, with the same formula, as כְּמִשְׁפָּט (1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. xxxv. 13; xxx. 16; Ezra iii. 4); as also to that founded upon the love for copious descriptions of the arrangements connected with public worship, with the temple music, and songs of the Levites in standing liturgical formulæ; for genealogies and public registers.³ Till it be first shewn that the book of Ezra proceeded from the scribe himself, these analogies between it and Chronicles fail to establish the position that Ezra wrote the latter work. They are just analogies, corroborating identity of authorship, not *Ezra*-authorship.

There is not the least foundation for believing that the compiler lived at Babylon. The use of such language as, "the treasures, all these he *brought to Babylon*" (2 Chron. xxxvi. 18) does not favour the idea that the writer was there; because the words, "many *brought gifts to the Lord to Jerusalem*" (2 Chron. xxxii. 23) would also shew that the writer was himself at *Jerusalem*, the same verb occurring in both places. When it is written "the king of Syria *brought Israel to Damascus*" (2 Chron. xxviii. 5) it does not follow from the use of the verb that the writer was at Damascus himself.

XI. ELIJAH'S LETTER IN 2 CHRON. xxi. 12-15.—Many shifts have been resorted to for the purpose of evading the Chronicle-writer's statements, which imply that Elijah's letter was sent to Jehoram, after he had been translated. It is indeed stated *apparently* that Jehoram began to reign during the lifetime of his father (2 Kings viii. 16); and in the same verse that

his reign commenced in the fifth year of Jehoram of Israel. In 2 Kings iii. 1 compared with 1 Kings xxii. 42, it is said that Jehoshaphat did not die till the seventh year of Jehoram of Israel. This would lead to the inference that Jehoram reigned two years jointly with his father Jehoshaphat; and so he was sole king 889-883 B.C. But in 2 Kings i. 17 it is implied that he reigned along with his father five years, leaving three for his individual sovereignty. Yet his reign is dated in several places *from the death* of his father Jehoshaphat (1 Kings xxii. 51; 2 Chron. xxi. 1, 5, 20); so that there must be a mistake somewhere, probably in 2 Kings viii. 16 where the words יהושפט מלך יהודה are omitted in the Complutensian and Aldine Septuagint, the Peshito, the Heptaplar Syriac of Paris, the Arabic, many MSS. of the Vulgate, various codices of Kennicott and De Rossi, and a number of early editions of the Hebrew text. One thing is pretty certain, that Elijah survived the time of Jehoram's joint reign with his father, if such co-regency be admitted. But there are strong grounds against the joint-sovereignty; and even if it were true, it does not clear up the chronology of the time, but rather introduces into it a new element of disturbance connected with the duration of Ahab's reign. We are persuaded, with Thenius and others, that the supposition of Jehoram's association with his father in the kingdom is untenable and baseless. Jehoram's murder of his brethren must have taken place *after* he became sole king; and the succession of events as given in 2 Kings makes it all but certain, that according to the compiler of those books, Elijah was alive when that murder happened; whereas the Chronicle-writer supposes his previous death. There is no ground for asserting that Jehoshaphat occupied himself for the last six or seven years of his life in conducting wars against Moab, etc., while Jehoram the son ruled at Jerusalem. To quote 2 Chron. xix. 4-11 for this hypothesis, is perfectly gratuitous. In like manner, it is a baseless assumption that Elijah survived till the sixth year of Jehoram's reign; and that the letter was sent by the prophet to him in the first or second year of his reign. As long as the letter is passed by in the books of Kings, we doubt its existence, because the compiler who speaks of it would lead us to infer that it was written after the prophet's translation—at least right chronology unavoidably tends to that conclusion.

In any case, the form of the letter shews that it was not written by Elijah himself. It speaks of the death of Jehoram's sons differently from 2 Kings x. 13; though it must be admitted that the Chronist narrates the death of his sons as the author of the Kings does. Only in one place, however, does he this, viz.,

2 Chron. xxii. 8; for in xxi. 17 their death is described in a manner similar to that of the letter. The epistle is brief and general—different from what we should expect of the prophet in the circumstances.

XII. 2 SAMUEL XXIV; 1 CHRON. XXI. — The narrative in 2 Sam. xxiv. and 1 Chron. xxi., respecting David's conduct in numbering the people, and the judgment that followed it, has a mythic envelope which should be stripped off before the plain historical facts be properly perceived. The intentions of the king seem to have been to form a standing army. Wishing to enlarge his empire by vast conquests, and forgetting that he should be contented with the defence of his territory, he proposed the substitution of a standing army for the military police in operation. The attempted innovation was both contrary to the law of Moses and impolitic. Joab himself disapproved of it, because the consequences were likely to be dangerous. A people accustomed to agriculture could scarcely have had such a yoke imposed upon them without dissatisfaction, because it would take away from the soil the necessary labourers. The measure was not entirely a *civil* one, since it was entrusted to a military commission under Joab, and supported, as it seems, by a strong detachment of troops; for we read of *pitching* in Aroer, etc. (2 Sam. xxiv. 5). The king's views, however, were not carried into effect, because a pestilence broke out, carrying away many; and Gad took occasion to indicate in the public calamity the chastisement of God offended with the monarch's presumptuous proceedings. David listened to the prophet's advice; and in order to appease the Deity, erected an altar for sacrifice on the threshing-floor of Araunah, on mount Moriah, whither the plague had not come.

THE BOOK OF EZRA.

I. UNION OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.—The books of Ezra and Nehemiah have been regarded as one by the Jews from an early period. They are so reckoned by Josephus and the Talmud. In the lists of canonical writings given by Origen, the council of Laodicea, Hilary, and Melito of Sardis, they are treated in the same way, and called the Book of Ezra. In the LXX. and Vulgate they are separated as the first and second book of Ezra. In the present Hebrew text and ancient versions the second has a title of its own, which separates it from the first; *the words of Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah*. At what time the separation took place cannot be ascertained. Origen speaks of it; in the list of the council of Laodicea Esdras first and second is mentioned; and Jerome was acquainted with the division. Our Hebrew Bibles still bear evidence of the Masoretic numbering of both as one, for they have no remarks at the close of Ezra.

II. CONTENTS.—The present book of Ezra is divided into two parts, viz., chaps. i.-vi. and vii.-x. The former contains the history of the exiles who returned under Zerubbabel and Jeshua, from the first year of Cyrus till the completion of the temple in the sixth year of Darius Hystaspis's reign. The second has notices of the return of the second company under Ezra, and his proceedings in Jerusalem. The first chapter commences with the proclamation of Cyrus for the restoration of the temple at Jerusalem. Invited by the monarch of Persia to return to their native land, the Jewish captives prepared to go back, taking with them vessels of gold and silver, and whatever precious things their neighbours willingly offered. Cyrus ordered his treasurer to bring out the sacred vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away from Jerusalem and placed in the temple of his own gods, and give them to Shesh-bazzar, *i.e.*, Zerubbabel, the prince of Judah (chap. i.). This is followed by a list of the persons who returned with Zerubbabel; arranged as common people, priests, Levites, singers, children of the porters, Nethinims, children of

Solomon's servants. In addition to these, were others, both common Israelites, and priests who could not shew their genealogy; the latter of whom were excluded by Zerubbabel from the sacerdotal class. The whole congregation together is said to have amounted to 42,360, beside 7,337 servants and maids, and 200 caravan assistants. The number of their beasts of burden is also stated; and then the amount of contributions made by the chief of the fathers towards the erection of the sacred house (chap. ii.).

The third chapter shews how the returned captives observed the feast of tabernacles. Under the direction of Jeshua the son of Jozadak, and Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, an altar was erected for burnt-offerings, on which they began to present sacrifices from the first day of the seventh month. Immediately after, workmen, including Tyrians and Sidonians who brought cedars from Lebanon by sea, were hired; and in the second month of the second year of the return to the holy city, the foundations of the new temple were laid. On this occasion great rejoicing was manifested. But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers that had seen the first house wept with a loud voice (chap. iii.).

The adversaries of Judah and Benjamin, who are usually supposed to be the colonists settled in the country by Esarhaddon, hearing of the rebuilding of the temple proposed to take part in the work. Not being accepted, they endeavoured to hinder the building, and succeeded in their object during all the days of Cyrus. In the reign of Cambyses they continued their opposition. In the days of Artaxerxes a letter was addressed to him, informing him that the Jewish colonists were rebuilding the rebellious city, and on its completion would refuse to pay toll or tribute, to the injury of the royal revenue; requesting also that search might be made among the national archives for the purpose of ascertaining the character of the city in the past. Accordingly the king caused instructions to be sent to the provincial officers to stop the proceedings at Jerusalem till further orders should be issued. Thus the work was hindered (chap. iv.).

In the second year of Darius, the people, encouraged by the prophets Haggai and Zachariah, recommenced the building of the temple, under the direction of Zerubbabel and Jeshua. But they were interrupted by the Persian local officers, and questioned respecting their authority. The work, however, did not cease. The Persians wrote to Darius respecting the matter, telling him what they had said and the answers of the Jews to their questions, requesting that search should be made into the truth of the facts alleged by the colonists. Search was made accordingly; and a decree of Cyrus was found, authorising the

restoration of the temple, as well as of the sacred vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away ; the expense of the rebuilding to be defrayed out of the royal treasure. A new decree was made for the furtherance of the work ; all farther obstruction was to cease ; and even victims for their sacrifices were ordered to be supplied. Thus favoured, the Jews proceeded to build ; and at length the work was finished on the third day of Adar, in the sixth year of Darius Hystaspis' reign. A joyous festival was kept at the dedication : the passover too was observed on the fourteenth day of the first month (chaps. v. vi.).

It is remarkable that the history is continued in the Chaldee language, after the letter to the king by Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the scribe had been given in that dialect (chap. iv.) throughout a long passage ; and that it terminates abruptly at the eighteenth verse of the sixth chapter, the Hebrew being resumed in the nineteenth verse.

In the reign of Artaxerxes, Ezra went up from Babylon to Jerusalem, the king having granted him all he requested. Accompanied by various Israelites, he arrived at the city on the fifth month in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. The letter given him by the king, in the original Chaldee, permitted as many as pleased to accompany him to Judea, recited that he was sent "to enquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem," as well as to carry the silver and gold which the king and his counsellors had spontaneously offered to the God of Israel, with all the silver and gold he could find in the province of Babylon, and the free-will offering of the people and priests. He was also to deliver safely the sacred vessels given him for the service of the temple. All the treasurers beyond the river were to deliver to Ezra a quantity of silver within certain limits, wheat, wine, oil, and salt without measure. None of the priests and Levites, singers, porters, Nethinims, or ministers of the house of God were to be charged toll, tribute, or custom. Ezra was also authorized to appoint magistrates and judges, and to punish offenders (vii. 1-26). He subjoins a few words of praise to Jehovah for all this favour ; and states that he had gathered together out of Israel leading men to go up with him. A list and the number of his companions is then given who encamped beside a river. When he came to inspect them, he found none of the family except priests, and therefore sent to Iddo the chief for Levitical servants. Having proclaimed a fast at the river of Ahava, to implore the divine protection, he selected twelve chief priests, to whose care he entrusted the sacred vessels and other property. On the twelfth day of the first month the band departed from the river of Ahava, arrived safely at Jerusalem, and offered burnt-offerings with a sin-offering to the God of

Israel. Having delivered the king's commissions to his lieutenants and governors on this side the river, the work of religious reformation advanced (vii. 27-viii.).

After this the princes presented themselves before Ezra, complaining that the people generally had contracted marriages with the surrounding idolaters. Astonished and deeply afflicted at this intelligence, he prayed fervently to Jehovah, confessing the sins and perversity of the people. After finishing this prayer, accompanied with great weeping, a large congregation assembled about him, and Shechaniah proposed that they should make a covenant with God by dismissing their foreign wives and the children born of them; which Ezra made them all swear to do. Ezra, mourning and fasting, caused proclamation to be made, requiring that all should repair to Jerusalem within three days under pain of confiscation of property, and excommunication. Agreeably to this summons they assembled at the appointed time; and all sat in the street of the house of God trembling. Being exhorted by Ezra to make confession to the Lord God and to separate themselves from the people of the land and foreign wives, they all consented to do so; but as the weather was rainy and the work could not be done in a day or two, it would be better to have appointed times at which all the guilty persons should come before the rulers, accompanied by the elders of the respective cities and the judges. The business was thus formally finished in three months. A list is given of the priests, Levites, singers, porters, and common people, who had married foreign wives (ix., x.).

III. THE NUMBER OF SACRED VESSELS STATED TO HAVE BEEN TAKEN FROM THE TEMPLE BY NEBUCHADNEZZAR. — In Ezra i. 7-11 the sacred vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away at several times from the temple are enumerated as, 30 chargers of gold, 1000 of silver, 29 knives, 30 cups of gold, 410 silver double cups, and 1000 other vessels. The whole number is given as 5,400; whereas the sum of those specified is only 2,499. The pseudo-Ezra mentions 1,000 cups of gold and 1,000 of silver, 29 silver knives, 30 chargers of gold, and 2,410 chargers of silver, with 1,000 other vessels; making together 5,469. Josephus makes up the number 5,400 from 50 golden and 500 silver vessels, 40 golden and 500 silver drinking vessels, 50 golden and 500 silver buckets, 30 golden and 300 silver cups, 30 golden and 2,400 silver chargers, and 100 other large vessels. Both the apocryphal Ezra and Josephus arbitrarily alter the Hebrew. The number 5,400 is exaggerated.

IV. LISTS OF THE NUMBERS OF RETURNED EXILES. — There are three lists of the number of returned exiles, viz., that in Ezra ii. 1-67; in the apocryphal Ezra or Esdras v. 7-43; and

Neh. vii. 6-69. . The three vary here and there both in relation to single names and the sum total, as will be seen from the following comparative table :

NEHEMIAH.

Parosh ... (with)	2172	Phoros ... (with)	2172	Parosh ... (with)	2172
Shephatiah ... "	372	Saphat ... "	372	Shephatiah ... "	372
Arah ... "	775	Ares ... "	756	Arah ... "	652
Pahath-Moab ... "	2812	Phaath-Moab ... "	2812	Pahath-Moab ... "	2818
Elam ... "	1254	Elam ... "	1254	Elam ... "	1254
Zattu ... "	945	Zathui ... "	975	Zattu ... "	845
Zaccai ... "	760	Corbe ... "	705	Zaccai ... "	760
Bani ... "	642	Bani ... "	648	Binnui ... "	648
Bebai ... "	623	Bebai ... "	633	Bebai ... "	628
Azgad ... "	1222	Avgai ... "	1322	Azgad ... "	2322
Adonikam ... "	666	Adonikan ... "	637	Adonikam ... "	667
Bigvai ... "	2056	Bagvi ... "	2606	Bigvai ... "	2067
Adin ... "	454	Adinos ... "	454	Adin ... "	655
Ater ... "	98	Ater ... "	92	Ater ... "	98
Bezai ... "	323	Ceilan & Azenan	67	Hashum ... "	328
Jorah ... "	112	Azaros ... "	432	Bezai ... "	324
Hashum ... "	223	Annis ... "	101	Hariph ... "	112
Gibbar ... "	95	Arom ... "	32	Gibeon ... "	95
Bethlehem ... "	123	Bassai ... "	323	Bethlehem and Ne-	
Netophah ... "	56	Arsiphurith	102	tophah ... "	188
Anathoth ... "	128	Baiterus ... "	3005	Anathoth ... "	128
Azmaveth ... "	42	Bethlomoï ... "	123	Beth-Azmaveth ... "	42
Kirjath-arim, Cephi-		Netophah ... "	55	Kirjath-jearim, Cep-	
rah, and Beeroth	743	Anathoth ... "	158	hirah and Beeroth	743
Ramah and Gaba ... "	621	Bethsamon	42	Ramah and Gaba	621
Michmas ... "	122	Kariathiri ... "	25	Michmas ... "	122
Bethel and Ai ... "	223	Caphira & Berog	743	Bethel and Ai ... "	123
Nebo ... "	52	Pira	700	Nebo ... "	52
Magbish ... "	156	Chadiassai & Ammidoi	422	Elam ... "	1254
The other Elam ... "	1254	Chirama & Gabbe	621	Harim ... "	320
Harim ... "	320	Macalon	621	Jericho ... "	345
Lod, Hadid and Ono	725	Betolio		Lod, Hadid, and Ono	721
Jericho ... "	345	Niphis	52	Senaah ... "	3930
Senaah ... "	3630	Magbish ... "	156		
		Calamolalus and Ono	725		
		Jerecho ... "	245		
		Sanaa ... "	3301		
The children of		The sons of		The children of	
Jedaiah ... "	973	Jeddo ... "	872	Jedaiah ... "	973
Immer ... "	1052	Emmeruth ... "	252	Immer ... "	1052
Pashur ... "	1247	Phassarur ... "	1047	Pashur ... "	1247
Harim ... "	1017	Carme ... "	217	Harim ... "	1017
Levites ... "	74	Levites ... "	74	Levites ... "	74
Singers ... "	128	Singers ... "	128	Singers ... "	148
Porters ... "	139	Posters ... "	139	Porters ... "	138
Nethinims ... "	392	Servants of the temple	372	Nethinims ... "	392
Israelites without a		Israelites without a		Israelites without a	
family register	652	family register	652	family register	642
Priests without a		Priests without the		Priests without the	
family register		same		same	

In Ezra, the aggregate of the preceding numbers is 29,818; in Nehemiah, 31,089. In the Septuagint Ezra it is 29,627; and in the Septuagint Nehemiah, 31,119. In Esdras of the

it is 30,043; of the Alexandrine codex, 33,932, of the Aldine, 33,949. But none of these, even the highest, reaches the given total, viz., 42,360. Josephus reckons the priests without a family register, 525; but their number is not in the Old Testament. Doubtless the three lists are imperfect; both names and numbers being deficient in all. It is impossible to tell which is on the whole the most accurate. If the number of *men* who returned under Zerubbabel or Sheshbazzar is 42,360, the sum total including their families probably amounted to 200,000 persons, provided the statement in 1 Esdras (v. 41) be incorrect in placing all boys above twelve years of age among the men; but if that writer be correct, the sum total would not be above 170,000. Of the whole, 4,289 were priests belonging to four great races or families; besides a number of priests who not being able to adduce their registers, were excluded from office on that account (525 according to Josephus). The Levites among them were but few, 360 or 341. There were 392 *Nethinim*. The people brought with them upwards of 7,500 slaves of both sexes and a number of horses, mules, camels, and asses, amounting to upwards of 7,000. The returning exiles belonged almost entirely to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi. According to Ezra ii. 1 and Neh. vii. 6, they returned "every one unto his city," a statement which hardly allows of the conjecture that a *great many Israelites* of the Assyrian exile joined the Jews. Comparatively few could have joined their brethren. In the course of 200 years their attachment to heathen customs and manners had been confirmed; and had they come back in great numbers, they would have settled again in their old abodes, in Israel; a fact unknown to history. It is an unfortunate conjecture of Prideaux's that 12,000 of the returning exiles belonged to Israel;¹ and it is still more incorrect to infer, that the whole number of such as preferred to remain in Assyria was six times the number of those who returned, because four courses only of the priests returned out of the twenty-four. If we reckon that nearly the half returned, we shall not be far from the truth.

V. AUTHORSHIP.—The first chapter begins with the closing words of the Chronicles as far as the middle of the third verse, which belong therefore to the Chronicle-writer. And the whole chapter betrays his pen. The edict of Cyrus given in the second, third, and fourth verses, must be a Judaising paraphrase of the original, else Cyrus could not speak of himself in such language as, "The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth;" which does not comport with his treat-

¹ The Old and New Testament connected, etc., vol. i. p. 136, edn. 1719.

ment of Cyaxares. This is corroborated by the fact that the decree is not the same here as in the sixth chapter, though it should be identical in words, if accurately given. The substantive use of the infinitive which characterises the Chronist, appears in the sixth and eleventh verses; and the number of the vessels of gold and silver (5,400) resembles the exaggerated numbers of the same writer. Whether the narrative be an extract from Ezra v. 13-16, vi. 3-5, as Zunz supposes,¹ is doubtful to our mind.

The second chapter was found as an original document, and inserted here by the Chronicle-writer.

The third chapter manifestly belongs to the Chronist, as the manner and language shew. Thus the law of Moses is referred to in the second and fourth verses, in a way which characterises the Chronicle author; the phrase *סֵמִי הָאֲרָצוֹת* is similar to that in 2 Chron. xiii. 9; xvii. 10; and, though found in Ezra's own writing, reminds the reader of the union of two plural forms so common in the Chronicles and contrary to the best usage. In the eighth and succeeding verses the Levites, and especially the singers in the temple, are referred to Asaph's lineage, as in Chronicles (see 1 Chron. vi. 24, etc.). The great rejoicings of the people at the temple-solemnities are often spoken of by the Chronist (comp. 2 Chron. xv. 15; xx. 27; xxiii. 18, etc., with Ezra iii. 11-13). And the use of the substantive infinitive-form in the eleventh verse points to the same writer.

From iv. 6 to 24 is an interpolation put in the wrong place by the redactor, for it belongs to Nehemiah's time, not to that of Ezra. Besides, it relates altogether to the building of *the city*, not *the temple*. It is impossible to say where it should be placed. The sixth verse passes suddenly to Xerxes (called Ahasuerus); and then Artaxerxes appears in the seventh. The twenty-fourth verse is the redactor's, resuming the narrative which had been interrupted by the interpolated piece. In consequence however of the word *בְּאֵרֶיךָ* then, which in its place at the commencement of the verse can only refer to what immediately precedes, the redactor makes the narrative say what is incorrect, by transferring to *the building of the temple* what related merely to the *rebuilding of the city*, and so putting Artaxerxes before Darius Hystaspis. The first five verses of chapter four belong to Ezra himself, as Zunz has rightly seen;² though he is wrong in including the sixth verse.

We assume that the name Artachschascht must be Artaxerxes Longimanus, not Smerdis as some have thought, which agrees

¹ Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, p. 21.

² Ibid. pp. 28, 29.

with the letter sent to him given in iv. 11-16 and the king's answer 17-23; for we know from Nehemiah that the building of the walls of Jerusalem was thought of under Artaxerxes; and the passages in question refer only to *the rebuilding of the city*. If they related to the *rebuilding of the temple* the case would be otherwise. But there is not a word of that. The language in iv. 12, "the Jews which came up *from thee* to us are come unto Jerusalem," can only refer to the colony that came under Ezra in the time of Artaxerxes, not to that under Nehemiah in the same reign, because of iv. 23, which does not agree with the record of the building under Nehemiah; and it would have been meaningless to write to Smerdis in that strain, understanding the expedition under Zerubbabel in the time of Cyrus. Besides, the adversaries write to the king to have search made "in the book of the record of thy fathers;" whereas at the time of Smerdis, they had been no more than fifteen years under the Persian dominion. Thus Artachschashta cannot mean Smerdis, with whom the name does not agree, but Artaxerxes. The writers of the letter carefully abstain from mentioning the previous building of the temple, the more effectually to prejudice the king's mind against the rebuilding of the city. Some will perhaps object to the statement that the Artaxerxes in iv. 7 and vii. 1-11 were the same, and allege that the compiler thought them different by giving the names a somewhat different orthography. It is observable that ארתחששתא is twice spelled with ש in iv. 7; while in vii. 1-11 it is with ד instead of *shin*, the compiler finding it so written in the two Chaldee pieces respectively. This however seems too small a point to insist upon. If it be of any weight, it makes no difference in our argument; for in any case the redactor was mistaken. There was no Artaxerxes before Darius, as well-attested history shews; or, to speak more correctly, none called ארתחששתא. Those who take Artachschashta to be Smerdis, necessarily regard Ahasuerus as Cambyses, which is contrary to the usual acceptance of the name in the book of Esther. The Old Testament never speaks of Cambyses and Smerdis: why should they be introduced here, especially as their mention would create greater difficulty than the more probable names Xerxes and Artaxerxes?¹ Nothing is more certain than that the passages in iv. 11-16 and 17-23 relate to the rebuilding of the walls, not the temple; and that therefore Artachschascht is Artaxerxes.

From v. 1-vi. 18 is another Chaldee document, which existed before the time of the compiler. In vi. 14 the last clause is the

¹ Bertheau, *Exeget. Handbuch*, xvii. p. 69 et seqq.

redactor's work, viz., "and Artaxerxes king of Persia" to make the passage agree with his insertion of iv. 6-24. Here the name Artaxerxes occurs again in connexion with the completion of the temple, and could not have proceeded from him who wrote v. 1-vi. 18. The name is a later insertion, as Hävernicks perceived;¹ though we cannot believe with him that Ezra added it, because he must have known that Artaxerxes did not promote the building of the temple, and would not even have appended his name out of gratitude for the great gifts that monarch made to the temple nor because he favoured the Jews generally, since by putting Artaxerxes along with Cyrus and Darius in this connection, Ezra would have misled the reader. Artaxerxes is here the addition of a later hand than that of the Chaldee author of the fragment presented in v. 1-vi. 18, because it clashes with what he had just written; and to ascribe it to Ezra is to make him use an unsuitable expression.

In v. 4 we read: "Then said *we* unto them after this manner, What are the names of the men that make this building?" Here it cannot certainly be inferred the writer was an eyewitness and contemporary, for the example of Joshua v. 6 is not valid, as De Wette has well observed.² To the compiler belongs vi. 19-22, which describes the celebration of a passover, whose attendant circumstances in honour of the Levites resemble the celebration of the passover under king Hezekiah, related in Chronicles (2 Chron. xxx. 15-25). In the twenty-second verse the king of Persia is termed *king of Assyria*, which reminds one of 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11.

The same redactor continues in vii. 1-11. Here he begins with a genealogy of Ezra (1-5) nearly agreeing with 1 Chron. vi. 35-38. The way in which Ezra is spoken of in verses 6, 10, 11, shews that he himself could not have so written. He is termed "a ready scribe in the law of Moses;" it is said that "he had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it;" and an explanation of סֵפֶר is given in the eleventh verse which is unsuitable to Ezra himself. The only objection to ascribing vii. 1-11 to the compiler or Chronist is, that he shews an acquaintance with the fact that Artaxerxes lived *after* Darius; while in iv. 7 he places him *before* Darius; but the Chronist was not careful to remove contradictions of this kind. He transcribed his sources without much elaboration. In vii. 12-26 we have a Chaldee piece, giving the written commission of Artaxerxes to Ezra to return with his countrymen to Judea. This is an authentic document communicated by Ezra.

From vii. 27-ix. 15 appears to have been written by Ezra

¹ Einleitung II., i. p. 293.

VOL. II.

² Einleitung, p. 289.

himself. He employs the first person. But there is reason for excepting the thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth verses of the eighth chapter, both because the first person plural is suddenly changed for the third person, and also on account of the want of connexion between the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth verses; a circumstance unlike Ezra's writing. They belong to the compiler, being a Chronist interpolation. A gap seems to have been where the verses now are; for the words *וּבְכָל־לַיְלָה* (ix. 1) imply that what is now related immediately succeeded something described before it; whereas according to the present text we are transported at once from the beginning of the month Ab to Kislev. Hence *אֵלֶּה*, *these*, refers to things that had been mentioned just before.

In x. 1-17 the Chronist re-appears. Six times is Ezra cited in these verses. It is also said that he went into the chamber of Johanan the son of Eliashib—of the high priest Eliashib who lived after Nehemiah (see Neh. xii. 22, 23); shewing that Ezra himself was not the writer. It is probable that in compiling the piece, the Chronist used accounts written by Ezra.

From x. 18 to the end of the chapter was inserted by the compiler. It was not written by the Chronist himself, but is older.

From this analysis it will appear, that the book of Ezra in its present form did not proceed from the scribe himself. Some pieces of his are in it; but another placed them there. The Chronicle-writer is the compiler; who made it up in part from pieces of Ezra and others, and partly by his own composition.

VI. ALLEGED UNITY AND INDEPENDENCE.—Keil, after the example of Hävernicks, is anxious to uphold *the unity* and *independence* of the book, claiming it all for Ezra himself with the exception of the Chaldee section in iv. 8-vi. 18, which the latter took, without alteration, into the body of the work.¹ How little ground there is for this view may be inferred from the preceding analysis, which shews that the work is incompact and inartificial. In speaking of Ezra, the writer sometimes uses the first person, sometimes the third; different parts are composed in different languages; two pieces are in Chaldee, which were not written by the same person; the style varies in various places; and there is an apparent chasm in the history of more than half a century, at the end of the sixth chapter—a real chasm in the opinion of such as make Artaxerxes in vii. 1, 11, etc., a different person from the Artaxerxes of iv. 7.

‘ In opposition to all these phenomena it is useless to appeal to

¹ Einleitung, pp. 456, 457.

the interchange of the first and third persons in the prophets, *ex. gr.*, Is. vii. 1-16, comp. with viii. 1, etc., Jer. xx. 1-6, comp. with verses 7, etc., xxviii. 1, etc., comp. with verses 5, etc., Ezek. i. 1-3, vi. 1; vii. 1, 8; Jer. xxxii. 1-8; Hosea i. 2, 3; iii. 1.

To account for the interchange Hävernicks¹ assumes an imitation of the prophetic usage by Ezra, which is utterly improbable. Still more inappropriate is it to appeal to writings of the present day for examples of a like *enallage* of persons; because such rhetorical figures, which belong to the impassioned language of poetry or prophecy, are unsuited to the style of Hebrew annals. The cases are not parallel; prophetic writing being very different from historical prose. There is no *necessity*, as Keil alleges, for Ezra to speak of himself in the third person in the first seven verses of the seventh chapter.² All the unity belonging to the work is that arising from its being the compilation of the Chronist, who put together materials relating to the times of Zerubbabel and Ezra, written by Ezra himself and others, interspersing his own composition. In consequence of the one redactor, there is considerable similarity of expression throughout; though certainly not enough to prevent the critic from separating the pieces of different writers incorporated into the work.

The independence of the book cannot be maintained. The identity of the termination of Chronicles with the commencement of Ezra shews one writer; and in connection with the abruptness of the former, that both were originally parts of the same work. It is likely that Ezra (with Nehemiah) was first put into the collection of sacred historical books; and that the portion now called the Chronicles, was appended to it as the last book, sometime afterwards. This agrees with the position of Chronicles in the Hagiographa, as the closing book. When the Chronicles were thus disposed in the canonical list, the last two verses now in 2 Chron. xxxvi. which stood already at the beginning of Ezra, were repeated, for the purpose of reminding the reader that the continuation of the narrative was to be found elsewhere. At the time of the LXX. the separation already existed, because the book of Ezra has a distinct title in their version. The beginning of the apocryphal Ezra or Esdras favours this view; the writer passing at once from the history in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21 to Ezra i., using the now separated books as one. The same conclusion is confirmed by the prevailing belief of the Jews that Ezra wrote both. The Talmud in one place asserts that Ezra wrote the work bearing his name and the genealogies (in the Chronicles) as far as the word וְ in 2 Chron. xxi. 2; but that

¹ Einleitung II. 1, pp. 280, 281.

² Einleitung, p. 457.

Nehemiah completed the book of Ezra. In another place this is contradicted and the whole ascribed to Nehemiah.

VII. PASSAGE IN JUSTIN MARTYR RESPECTING EZRA.—A remarkable passage occurs regarding the typical import of the passover in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with the Jew Trypho. In it Ezra is supposed to address the people before the celebration of the passover, and to explain to them its mystery as connected with Christ. Justin insinuates that the Jews early expunged the words from their Hebrew copies. The passage runs thus: "And Ezra said to the people, This passover is our Saviour and our refuge. And if ye understand, and it enter into your heart that we are about to humble him in the sign, and after this shall trust in him, this place shall not be made desolate for ever, saith the Lord of Hosts. But if ye will not believe on Him, nor hear His preaching, ye shall be a laughing-stock to the Gentiles."¹ These words were doubtless written by some Christian; and were early inserted in copies of the Septuagint at Ezra vi. 21. Lactantius has them in Latin, with some variations. It is strange that any one at the present day should suppose that the Hebrew ever had them, because their spuriousness is manifest.

¹ *Justini Martyris Apologiae duae et Apologus, etc.*, pp. 292, 293, ed. Thirlby, 1722.

THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH.

I. CONTENTS.—Nehemiah relates that, being in the palace at Shushan in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, he inquired concerning those Jews that had returned from Chaldea to their own land, and learned that they were in great affliction; that the wall of Jerusalem was broken down and its gates burned. Deeply affected with this information, he mourned, fasted, and prayed before the God of heaven, confessing the sins of Israel and beseeching Him to remember his promise made to Moses that when scattered abroad the repenting people should be restored. Some months after, as Nehemiah was serving king Artaxerxes in capacity of cupbearer, the latter noticed the sadness of his countenance, and inquired its cause. Hearing that it arose from the desolation of Jerusalem, the king asked what request he had to make; on which Nehemiah prayed for leave to visit and rebuild the city of Jerusalem. Leave of absence for a definite time being granted, he received, in accordance with his farther request, letters to the king's viceroys beyond the river, enjoining them to conduct him safely to Judah; and to the keeper of the royal forest, to provide him with timber for building. Thus commissioned, and furnished with an escort of horsemen, he came to Jerusalem to the great grief of Sanballat and Tobiah. He examined the walls of the city by night, accompanied by a few friends, noiselessly. After this, he told the principal men of the Jews the encouraging words he had received from Artaxerxes, and invited them to join him in the work of rebuilding. Notwithstanding the opposition and scoffs of the enemies, the Jews engaged in the undertaking, trusting in the God of heaven (chaps. i. and ii.).

This is followed by an enumeration of the various persons who executed different tasks in repairing the gates and walls. All ranks and sexes assisted. When Sanballat heard that the wall was being rebuilt he was very wroth, and mocked the Jews. But Nehemiah prayed that the reproach of the enemy might be turned upon their own head, and continued to work. After

the wall had been built round about half its height, Nehemiah heard of a conspiracy on the part of the adversaries to attack the city and destroy what had been done. Hence he set a watch against them, arranging the people after their families with their swords, spears, and bows. This measure frustrated the plan of their enemies, and enabled all to resume their work. From that time, however, it was thought prudent to have the labourers work with arms by their side; and to have half Nehemiah's servants doing military duty, with their officers in their rear. A trumpeter was stationed beside Nehemiah to gather the people together in case of attack. An order was given for every one with his servant to lodge within Jerusalem; and Nehemiah himself, his family, servants, and body-guard, wore their clothes day and night, never putting them off, except for washing (iii. iv.).

We are next told that great dissatisfaction was expressed by numbers of the people against their brethren, because when obliged to contract debts for the maintenance of their families and the payment of royal taxes, their creditors had required them to mortgage lands, vineyards, and houses, and to pledge their children as slaves, whom they could not redeem. Displeased when he heard this, Nehemiah rebuked the nobles and rulers, exhorted them to desist from usury, quoting himself as an example of abstinence from such practices, and to make restitution. On their promising to do so, he called the priests, and made them swear to that effect, solemnly appealing to God against those who should violate their promise. But it was kept. Nehemiah spoke to them on this occasion of the manner in which he had acted, from the time of his appointment as governor in the land. During the twelve years of official life, he had taken no pay, and was not chargeable to the people, as the former governors had been. He had not permitted his servants to exercise any authority over the Jews, but had worked along with them on the wall, and entertained at his table a hundred and fifty of the Jews and rulers, besides those that came from the heathen round about. His daily allowance of food prepared at his own charge is then specified (v.).

When Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem heard that the wall was built, they sent him a deceitful proposal to meet in one of the villages. Nehemiah declined, pleading the great work he had to do. Four times the message was sent and refused. The fifth time Sanballat sent a servant with an open letter in his hand, in which it was written that the heathens reported that Nehemiah and the Jews intended to rebel, and cause himself to be appointed king. A threat was held out, that it should be reported to the king, and an interview was again solicited.

Nehemiah replied by denying the facts alleged, and charging them on the writer's own invention. Afterwards coming to the house of Shemaiah, he was advised to shut himself up in the temple, lest assassins should come to slay him by night; but perceived that this person was hired by the enemy to bring him into fear and a snare, and therefore refused to do as he was advised, trusting himself to God's protection.

At length the wall was finished in fifty-two days, to the great discomfiture of the adversaries. Yet a secret-correspondence was carried on between the nobles of Judah and Tobiah, who, as well as his son, was allied by marriage with many families (vi.). After this Nehemiah committed the charge of Jerusalem to his brother Hanani and Hananiah the ruler of the palace, giving them strict orders to keep the gates shut during certain hours, and to appoint watches of the inhabitants. The city being large and the population scanty, especial attention was required for the security of the place. Intending to gather together the nobles, rulers, and people, that they might be reckoned by genealogy, he found a genealogical register of those who first returned from Chaldea, a copy of which he inserts (vii.). Here the first personal pronoun ceases to be used, and does not occur again till xii. 31.

The people now assembled and requested Ezra to bring forth the book of the law of Moses; which he did on the first day of the seventh month, and read it from a raised platform in the hearing of all the people. Levites and others who surrounded the scribe gave the sense of what was read, making it intelligible to the listeners. The reading caused general mourning and weeping. But Nehemiah, Ezra, and the Levites comforted the people, telling them that the day was holy unto the Lord, and was a joyous, not sad, festivity, being the feast of tabernacles. On the second day, the principal persons, priests, and Levites went again to Ezra to understand the words of the law; and being instructed, they made booths, kept the feast seven days, and held a solemn assembly on the eighth (chap. viii.).

On the 24th of Tisri, there was a general assembly of the people, on which they put on sackcloth and fasted, separating themselves from all strangers, and confessing their sins. Some of the Levites led the devotions and uttered a long prayer, in which a brief review of God's past ways towards the Israelites, through the successive ages of their history, is given. In this prayer the perverseness of the people is bewailed, their disobedience and repeated provocations of the divine anger; and a profession of obedience recorded by entering into a covenant, which was written and subscribed by priests, Levites, and leading persons to the number of eighty-three. The rest of the people

entered into an oath to keep the law of Moses, to abstain from intermarriages with the surrounding heathen, to have no buying or selling on the sabbath day or a holy day, to keep the sabbatical year, to forgive debts, to contribute the third part of a shekel for the support of the temple, to provide wood for the altar, and to bring the first fruits of their produce yearly into the sacred treasury, including the firstlings of the flocks and herds as well as the tithes (chaps. ix. x.).

While the rulers of the people dwelt at Jerusalem and the population was very scanty, the rest of the people cast lots for one in ten to increase the number of inhabitants; and some voluntarily offered themselves as residents. We have then a list of the chiefs of Judea (now a Persian province) who dwelt at Jerusalem. This is followed by an enumeration of the places of settlement of the priests, Levites, and Nethinims, and of the posterity of Judah and Benjamin (xi.)

The twelfth chapter commences with a catalogue of the priests and Levites who returned from captivity with Zerubbabel. The succession of high priests from Jeshua to Jaddua is given, with a list of priests, chiefs of the fathers in the days of Joiakim, of certain chief Levites in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua, and the names as well as employments of musicians and porters at different times (xii. 1-26).

The history proceeds to describe the public rejoicings with which Nehemiah dedicated the walls at their completion. The Levites were brought into Jerusalem from their different habitations; the sons of the singers assembled; the priests and Levites purified themselves, the people, and the wall with its gates. The princes of Judah were drawn up by Nehemiah on the wall, and divided into two companies, one of which, preceded by Ezra and attended by a number of priests' sons with musical instruments, went up by the stairs of the city of David; while the other company, followed by Nehemiah, proceeded along a different route. They met in the temple: the singers sang loud, great sacrifices were offered, and the rejoicing was great. At that time some were appointed to collect their legal contributions for the priests and Levites. The singers and porters, who were arranged according to the directions of David and Solomon, had their due maintenance from day to day (xii. 27-47).

In the reading of the law it was found that the Ammonite and Moabite were to be excluded for ever from the congregation; and therefore they separated the mixed multitude from Israel. Before this, Eliashib the priest had become allied with Tobiah the Ammonite; and had prepared for him a large apartment which had formerly been used as a storeroom for the tithes.

offerings contributed for the priests and their assistants. It was in the absence of Nehemiah that this occurred; for he had returned to Artaxerxes to Babylon, in the thirty-second year of that monarch's reign. When he came back and heard of the irregularity committed by Eliashib, he cleared the apartment of Tobiah's goods, cleansed it, and restored it to its former use. He also reformed certain offices in the temple; finding that the Levites and singers were scattered because they had not received their proper provision. And as the Sabbath was profaned by secular work and Tyrian commerce, he reproved the nobles of Judah for this evil as well as the last; and commanded the gates to be shut on the eve of the Sabbath. In consequence of this the merchants and sellers of wares lodged without the walls a few times; but on being threatened they came no more on the Sabbath. Levites were stationed at the gates to keep them. Observing Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, Ammon and Moab, whose children could not speak in the national tongue of the Jews but used in part the corrupt dialect of Ashdod, he became exceedingly indignant with them; cursing and striking some of them; plucking off their hair, and making them swear by God to contract no more alliances of the kind. A grandson of Eliashib the high priest had become son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite, and was expelled by Nehemiah. Having thus cleansed the priesthood from all foreigners, and appointed the wards of the priests and Levites, he concluded his memoranda with that brief prayer which he had often uttered before, "Remember me, O my God, for good" (xiii.).

We have already adverted to the similarity of the register contained in Neh. vii. 6-69 to that in Ezra ii. 1-67, and the variations in it. Both are copies of one and the same list of persons who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel.

II. COMPARISON OF NEH. XI. 3-24 WITH 1 CHRON. IX. 1-22.—The list of the post-exile inhabitants of Jerusalem in Neh. xi. 3-24 is so like in structure and in many of its statements to one in 1 Chron. ix. 1-22 that they can hardly have had an independent origin. But the variations between them should not be pronounced corruptions, unless it could be shewn that they refer exactly to the same time. The catalogue in Nehemiah belongs to an earlier point of time than the one in 1 Chron. ix. Yet the interval was not great; since several of those named in Nehemiah were still alive according to the account in 1 Chron.; such as Asaiah the Shilonite (called Maaseiah in Neh. xi. 5); Sallu the Benjamite; Adaiah the priest; Shemaiah the Levite. Again, a son of Judah the son of Senuah (Neh. xi. 9), who was second in command over the city, appears in 1 Chron. ix. 7 among the Benjamites; Hadariah and Judah being probably

identical. Seraiah's younger brother, Azariah, appears as a ruler of the temple (Neh. xi. 11; 1 Chron. ix. 11); and in Neh. xi. 13, a great-grandson of Meshillemoth is found among the heads of the priests, but in 1 Chron. ix. 12 a great-great-grandson. Another argument derived from the increase of numbers in 1 Chron. ix. as compared with Neh. xi. has been before adverted to.¹

III. EXAMINATION OF NEH. x. 2-28.—In Neh. x. 2-28 various names of persons who subscribed the covenant in Nehemiah's time are the names of persons whose "children," that is *posterity*, are said to have come to Jerusalem along with Zerubbabel, nearly a century before. The coincident names are Azariah, Pashur, Harim, Jeshua, Binnui, Parosh, Pahath-moab, Elam, Zattu, Azgad, Bebai, Bigvai, Adin, Ater, Hashum, Bezai, Hariph, Rehum. How is this to be explained? Let us first consider the names of *priests* in the list. Twenty-one are given relating to *classes* of priests (3-9). But we learn from Ezra ii. 36-39, that there were but four classes of them who returned at the time of Joshua and Zerubbabel; Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim. In Neh. xii. 1-7, a list of twenty-two classes is given that went up with Zerubbabel and Joshua. How are these accounts to be brought into harmony? The original number, four classes, containing 4,289 priests, is given in Ezra ii. 36-39. It was immediately enlarged, from endeavours to bring the new arrangements of the restored congregation into conformity with those of the pre-exile one. Twenty-four classes were soon instituted. Jedaiah and Immer (Ezra ii.) are wanting in Neh. x. 3-9; and Joiarib (Neh. xii. 6) is also absent. - These three make up the number twenty-four. But why their names are absent in x. 3-9 we cannot tell. It may be that they were afterwards omitted by mistake. Or, it may be, as Bertheau conjectures, that they refused to subscribe, being dissatisfied with the stringent regulations of Ezra and Nehemiah. On comparing 1 Chron. xxiv. 7-19 we find seven names of sacerdotal classes corresponding to seven in Neh. xii. 1-8, Jehoiarib, Jedaiah, Mijamin, Abijah, Shecaniah, Bilgah, Maaziah. This identity makes it probable that the new church endeavoured to restore the old pre-exile one as nearly as possible. From the imperfection of the list, and our ignorance of many circumstances connected with the ecclesiastical reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah, entire satisfaction cannot be had.

In Neh. x. 10-14 seventeen names of *Levitical* classes are given. Eight classes are mentioned in the time of the high priest Jeshua (xii. 8, etc.); the names Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel, Sherebiah, being identical in the two lists.

¹ See Herzfeld's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. i. pp. 298, 299.

In Neh. x. 15-28, the *heads of the people* are enumerated; and several of them also occur in Ezra ii. and Neh. vii. Here, however, there are forty-four names, while Ezra has but thirty-three. The number had increased in the interval between Zerubbabel and Nehemiah.

Similarity of names also appears in Neh. xii. and xi. thus :

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| xii. | xi. |
| 7. Sallu, Jedaiah. | 7, 10. Sallu, Jedaiah. |
| 8, 9. Mattaniah, Bakkukiah. | 17. Mattaniah, Bakkukiah. ¹ |

IV. TIME OF NEHEMIAH'S ADMINISTRATION.—The time of Nehemiah's administration at Jerusalem is not easily ascertained. In the twentieth year of Artaxerxes he first visited Jerusalem 445 B.C., in the thirteenth year of Ezra's public life at the same place; and remained there twelve years. Hence he returned to Babylon B.C. 430; the year of Eliashib's death (Neh. xiii. 28). It is not stated how long he remained at the Persian court before his second visit to Judea. Hävernick² has rightly inferred from xiii. 6, that he revisited Jerusalem while Artaxerxes was still king; the word *king* meaning none other than that monarch. As Artaxerxes died in 424 B.C., Nehemiah's stay is limited to less than six years. Perhaps he came back B.C. 423, allowing an interval long enough to account for all the disorder and corruption that had arisen in his absence. Thus he lived in the time of Joiada the high priest and of Durius Nothus; but it is not likely he survived Joiada, who died in B.C. 402.

The account in Nehemiah respecting Sanballat and his associates, is quite falsified by Josephus, who makes him governor of Samaria. He was an Arabian (vi. 1), and had nothing to do with the Samaritans, as far as the Bible narrative intimates. It is also incorrect in the Jewish historian to put him in the time of Alexander the Great.³ For what reason his son-in-law Manasseh is called high-priest by the same writer, we are unable to see; since the sacred record does not mention Manasseh. But notwithstanding such blundering on the part of Josephus, many authors have followed him; thoughtlessly representing the state of affairs in the time of Nehemiah as the uninspired historian describes it.

V. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE.—The passage i. 1-vii. 5 professedly belongs to Nehemiah himself. The first person singular is employed in it, and everything favours its authenticity. The style is lively, exact, and forcible. Peculiar phrases return here and there which seem to be characteristic of the narrator, such

¹ Comp. Bertheau, Exeget. Handbuch, xvii. p. 228 et seqq.; and Hensfeld, Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. i. p. 312.

² Einleitung, ii. 1, p. 324.

³ Antiqq. xi. 7, 8.

as *the good hand of my God upon me* (ii. 8 ; ii. 18), *my God put in my heart* (ii. 12 ; vii. 5). Sanballat *mocked* the Jews (ii. 19 ; iii. 33), *think upon, according to what is done* (v. 19 ; vi. 14, etc.). Two words in the section seem to have been an interpolation on the part of the Chronist, "Now it came to pass, when the wall was built, and I had set up the doors, and the porters and the singers and the Levites were appointed," etc. (vii. 1). Here an interpolator, misunderstanding the word *השוערים* by explaining it of *the temple* not *the city-watchman*, added, "the singers and the Levites."

The passage xii. 31-40 shews itself to be of the same authorship by the use of the first person and other internal marks, such as similarity of style to i. 1-vii. 5.

A third passage proceeding from Nehemiah is xiii. 4-31, where the first person singular is again employed, and the same kind of language appears. The three pieces exemplify the earnestness of the person relating the transactions in which he was engaged, and his self-esteem.

Chap. vii. 6-66 contains a genealogical register found by Nehemiah, and therefore older than his time. There are two suppositions respecting it, viz., that he himself inserted it, or that some later person did so. The former is the more probable because of the relation between xi. 1, etc., and vii. 4, the one detailing the measures taken by Nehemiah to remedy the smallness of the population referred to in the other, and both being connected by a list of the people who had returned from captivity. Instead of numbering the Jews as a necessary preparation for filling Jerusalem with an adequate amount of inhabitants, he did what was akin to it; *i.e.*, he laid down for the basis of his measures the register contained in an old list which is in Ezra ii. 1-67. He inserted this list in his memoranda. But if Nehemiah's object was thus to give numbers rather than genealogies, why did he not stop with the sixty-sixth verse? Why did he append verses 67-73, which appear superfluous as far as his purpose was concerned? A satisfactory answer cannot be given to these questions, unless by discovering all connexion between Nehemiah and the verses in question, which we cannot well do. That Nehemiah took them from the same source as the preceding, vii. 6-66, can hardly be doubted, because they are nearly identical with Ezra ii. 65-70, and because, on any other supposition, they must refer to his own time; a thing that the sixty-seventh, sixty-eighth, and sixty-ninth verses render impossible. Thus we conclude that vii. 6-73a was incorporated among his memoranda by Nehemiah himself.

In vii. 73b.-x. 40 we cannot recognise the evidences of Nehemiah-authorship, and are therefore obliged to attribute the sec-

tion to another writer. That Nehemiah was not the writer is inferred from the following phenomena.

1. Nehemiah no longer appears the prominent person as before, but occupies a very subordinate place. He is now the *Tirshatha*, viii. 9; x. 2; whereas he had been previously styled the *governor*, v. 14, 15, 18.

We cannot see that the answer of Keil to this argument is sufficient, viz., that Nehemiah as the civil stadtholder of the Persian king was not a fit person to conduct the religious solemnity described in the eighth chapter, which belonged only to the priest and scribe Ezra, but could appear on the occasion as nothing more than a principal member of the Israelitish church, and seal the document renewing the covenant at the head of the people's representatives.¹ We learn from 2 Maccab. i. 18, 21 that if Nehemiah was not of a priestly family, he at least ordered the priests to offer a sacrifice; and there is nothing connected with the person or functions of Nehemiah as he is before depicted, which would make him unsuitable for the prominent place occupied by Ezra in the eighth chapter; especially as there were Levites and priests associated with him. The same critic alleges that פֶּהָרָה *governor* merely expresses official position; whereas *Tirshatha* is the official title of the Persian governor of Judea, which is appropriate in the present official act. The distinction is arbitrary.

2. The names *Jehovah*, *Adonai*, *Elohim*, are here used promiscuously (viii. 1, 6, 8, 9, 14, 16, etc.); whereas *Elohim* is the prevailing word in Nehemiah, except i. 5, 11; iv. 8, where *Jehovah* and *Adonai* occur.

The words פְּנִיָּם, הָרִים *nobles, rulers* occur in ii. 16; iv. 8, 13; v. 7, 17; vi. 17; vii. 5; xii. 40; xiii. 11, but not in viii.-x. where the corresponding expression is רֹאשֵׁי הָאָבוֹת *heads of the fathers*, viii. 13.²

Keil affirms that this distinction arises from the difference of subjects-treated; and that *nobles* or *rulers* could not be spoken of in viii.-x. along with the priests and Levites, but only *heads of the fathers* as representatives of the people.³ We cannot see the justice or truth of this assertion.

3. The eighth chapter speaks of the celebration of the feast of tabernacles, at which Nehemiah as well as Ezra was present. Of this celebration we read: "since the days of Joshua the son of Nun unto that day had not the children of Israel done so." But in Ezra iii. it is said that the feast of tabernacles was kept by the people under Zerubbabel. The former words of Neh.

¹ Einleitung, page 462.

² Einleitung, page 463.

³ See De Wette's Einleit., p. 291.

viii. 17 exclude this preceding solemnity which had been kept within the century; for it is vain to allege that *כִּי כֵן* *so*, means that the joy and zeal were *so great* as that the law was read and explained to the people each day of the feast. Besides, the information concerning the feast is represented to have been as new to the people, in the second instance as in the first. What else do the words, "and on the second day were gathered together the chief of the fathers of all the people, the priests, and the Levites, unto Ezra the scribe, even to understand the words of the law. And they found written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month;"—what else do these words imply, than that the people now found from the law when and how the feast should be kept; a thing of which they had been ignorant before? The language does not naturally comport either with the fact of the people's former acquaintance with the law of Moses, or their having kept the same feast already under Zerubbabel. Hence Nehemiah, who is represented as an eye-witness and partaker of the solemn festivity on this second occasion, could not have written what contradicts Ezra iii. 4; which viii. 17 plainly does.¹

4. There is a verbal similarity between the commencement of the eighth chapter of Nehemiah and Ezra iii. 1, thus :

NEHEMIAH.

"And when the seventh month came, the children of Israel were in their cities; and all the people gathered themselves together as one man into the street that was before the water-gate," etc.

EZRA.

"And when the seventh month was come and the children of Israel were in the cities, the people gathered themselves together as one man to Jerusalem," etc.

This passage immediately succeeds an interpolated document in both, which document has several variations as given in the two places. It is therefore unlikely that Nehemiah wrote the beginning of chapter viii., especially as it proceeds to put Ezra in the foreground and himself in the back; drops the first person singular for the third; lays aside the characteristic features of his narratives; and puts an earlier history into a later period than that to which the book of Ezra assigns it. Nehemiah could not have found in connection with the register he discovered and gives in chap. vii., the description with which the eighth chapter commences; because in the book of Ezra another and earlier history is found in the same connection. And he could not have himself been the writer of viii. 1, etc.; for a different style is assumed, and the history is only a reproduction of what is in Ezra iii. 1-3 and ix., in which the former materials

¹ De Wette, Einleit. p. 292.

are dressed out with an application to Ezra and Nehemiah of what had been related of Zerubbabel. Had Nehemiah been the author, he would have written, as an eye-witness, what was correct and true. We cannot suppose him giving an authentic account of what occurred in his time; because there is a manifest imitation of Ezra iii. and ix. in a style very unlike his own.

Nor can Ezra have been the writer of the present section any more than Nehemiah, though Hävernicks advocates this view.¹ It is true that in x. 1 the person writing is represented as contemporary with the transactions; that Ezra himself appears as the leading person (viii. 2, etc.); and that his name does not appear among those who sealed or subscribed (x. 2-27); whence it has been inferred that he wrote the document, including himself among the subscribers (x. 1 and 31). But surely the prominence given to Ezra in the eighth chapter is against his authorship; and the fact of his name being absent from the list of those who sealed militates against his presence on the 24th of Tisri. Had Ezra written the document he would certainly have signed it; for it is gratuitous to say with Keil he could not have done so because he was mediator between God and the people. Perhaps Zidkijah, who is given next to Nehemiah (x. 2) and precedes Seraiah the ruler of the temple, consequently no obscure man, was the same as Zadok the scribe (Neh. xiii. 13). He subscribes before all the priests, which it was natural for him to do as the composer of the document. Had Ezra signed he must have done so in Zadok's place. He could not have subscribed after him.

The section before us, viz., vii. 73b.-x., belongs to the Chronicle-writer, the final redactor of the book of Nehemiah, as internal evidence shews. Thus the eighth chapter speaks of gatherings together of the people, of Levites taking a prominent part in the transactions recorded, of great rejoicings at the feast, and of such a Mosaic feast as had not occurred for a very long time (comp. 2 Chron. vii. 9, viii. 13, xxx. 1-5, 13-26, xxxv. 1-19). In like manner it is characteristic of him that he makes no mention of the day of atonement, though it occurred but five days before the beginning of the feast of the tabernacles; that he contradicts what he himself had said already of the former festival (Ezra iii. 4); and quotes as in the law of Moses what is not there, viz., "that they should publish and proclaim in all their cities, and in Jerusalem, saying, Go forth unto the mount and fetch olive branches, and pine branches, and myrtle branches, and palm branches, and branches of thick trees," etc. (ver. 15).

¹ Einleitung, II., i. p. 307.

The frequent citations of the Pentateuch (viii. 14-18) characterise the same compiler; and the designation of the Levites as **מְבִנִּים** **הָעֵם** or **מְבִנִּים** alone, (viii. 3, 7-9; x. 29) resembles what occurs in 1 Chron. xv. 29, xxv. 8, xxvii. 32. The remark that such a feast had not been observed since the days of Joshua (viii. 17) is in the manner of the same, ii. 7, 9, viii. 13. The interchange of **וַיַּעֲמְדוּ** and **וַיִּקְוּמוּ** (ix. 2, 3) and the infinitive **וַיִּבְנוּ** (ix. 13) are also like the Chronist. The Persian kings are again called *Kings of Assyria* (ix. 32) as in Ezra vi. 22. As to the prayer of the Levites in ix. 6-37, it consists, with a few exceptions, of reminiscences from the Pentateuch, and has many repetitions. The phrase **עָבְדֵי הָאֲרָצוֹת** (ix. 30, x. 29) is Chronistic, as has been observed before. So also is "the porters and the singers" in x. 40; and **לְעֵתִים מְבִנִּים** *at times appointed* (comp. Neh. x. 35 with Ezra. x. 14). The particulars just adduced are a sufficient counterpoise to Stähelin's denial that the section proceeded from the Chronist.¹

We do not think that the Chronist was *the proper author* of all the section before us. He compiled it, writing himself, as appears to us, chaps. viii. and ix. Nor can we agree with Herzfeld² in supposing the prayer of the Levites in ix. 6-37, a relatively genuine production. But the *tenth* chapter may have proceeded at first from Nehemiah himself; as the use of the first person at the first verse, the names of those who subscribed the covenant, the document given in x. 29-40, and the presents **מִחֻיָּקִים** and **בָּאִים** (x. 30) shew. The Chronist, however, has interpolated the chapter, so that it is not now as originally written. The twenty-ninth verse, for example, which somewhat interrupts the connection, has plain marks of the Chronist's pen.

The eleventh chapter belongs to the time of Nehemiah; for, according to Neh. xii. 8, Mattaniah was one of those who presided over the singers in the days of Joshua the high priest; and we learn from Neh. xi. 17, that Mattaniah was the son of Micha, the son of Zabdi, the son of Asaph. A great grandson of his, Zechariah, was at the dedication of the walls; as we learn from Neh. xii. 35, where Zabdi is called Zaccur; and we find another great grandson, Uzzi (Neh. xi. 22) now overseer of the Levites at Jerusalem. All this agrees with putting the catalogue in the time of Nehemiah, somewhat later than when the walls were solemnly dedicated. There is nothing against the supposition that Nehemiah himself wrote it. It connects imme-

¹ Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des alten Testaments, p. 166.

² Geschichte des V. Israel, p. 311.

diately with, and forms a proper continuation of, vii. 4. That the first and second verses are too silent about the good deeds of the reformer to have proceeded from himself, is an objection of no weight, though stated by Herzfeld.¹ The greater part of the chapter consists of a statistical table (3-24), the first two verses being introductory, and the last twelve a kind of appendix. Some interpolations may be detected, viz., in the seventeenth verse the words **רֹאשׁ הַתְּחִלָּה יְהוֹדָה לַתְּפִלָּה** (to be substituted for **הַתְּחִלָּה**), have been inserted by the Chronist in commendation of the singers of Asaph's family. The second half of the twenty-second verse, and the twenty-third, were interpolated by the same.² We cannot agree with Zunz in supposing the eleventh verse to be Chronistic. Proceeding from the Chronicle-writer, he thinks that his present erroneousness may be rectified by himself (1 Chron. ix. 11), *i.e.*, instead of Seraiah (who lived in Jeremiah's time) we should read Azariah. But Azariah may have been a younger brother of Seraiah, and both may be mentioned together in x. 3. The Seraiah in Jeremiah's days is not confounded with the Seraiah here mentioned, because the former was the son of Azariah, the son of Hilkiah, the son of Shallum, the son of Zadok, the son of Ahitub (1 Chron. v. 38-40); whereas the latter was the son of Hilkiah, son of Meshullam, son of Zadok, son of Meraioth, son of Ahitub (xi. 11). The same names appear among their forefathers, because they belonged to the same family. Nor should the twenty-fourth verse be assigned with Zunz to the interpolator or Chronist. It presents no ground for the hypothesis.³

It will be noticed that we separate the eleventh chapter from the tenth, believing it to have no proper connection with the latter, and join it to the first four verses of the seventh. This is contrary to Herzfeld's view, who takes viii. 1-xi. 36 as one connected section, or rather viii. 1-xii. 26 as a united whole, assigning it to another author than Nehemiah.

We may now consider xii. 1-26, which seems to be appended somewhat loosely to the preceding narrative. It was not written by Nehemiah, else he would not have spoken of himself in the twenty-sixth verse as "the governor." That verse runs thus: "These were in the days of Joiakim the son of Jeshua, the son of Jozadak, and in the days of Nehemiah the governor, and of Ezra the priest, the scribe." Herzfeld argues that this cannot refer solely to the preceding xii. 1-25 since the section in question contains almost as many notices relating to the time of Jeshua as to that of his son Joiakim; and it appears un-

¹ Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. i. p. 314.

² Ibid, p. 312.

³ Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, p. 26.

suitable in enumerating the principal priests and Levites to have respect to their being contemporary with Ezra and Nehemiah with whom they had no connection. Hence he infers that xii. 26 must refer to something before xii. 1-25, probably to viii. 1, etc. It was an ancient opinion, as we learn from Josephus, that Joiakim and Ezra died about the same time, according to which Ezra and Nehemiah were to be put in Joiakim's days; and a chronology results, deviating in some respects from that in Neh. iii. 1; for the events related in viii. 1, etc., are represented to be somewhat earlier than Neh. iii. 1 assumes, in the latter days of Joiakim instead of his son Eliashib.¹

We greatly doubt the validity of this reasoning. The twenty-sixth verse refers to the twelfth, and there is no need to suppose any ulterior allusion. There is no proper union between chaps. xi. and xii. 1-26; and Herzfeld's attempt to make them parts of one and the same original section appears to us a failure. Nehemiah himself did not insert xii. 1-26 into his memoranda, because the heads of the priests and Levites of his own time are absent from the list. It proceeded from the Chronicle-writer, for in verses 10, 11, 22, the high priest's family register is brought down to Jaddua, a supposed contemporary of Alexander the Great; and the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses are full of well-known phrases characteristic of the Chronist. Herzfeld indeed argues, that the section could not have been inserted by this compiler because xii. 27-xiii. 3 proceeds from him in part, and it would be singular in any writer to have a concluding formula like that in xii. 26 before a proper conclusion.² But the basis of xii. 27-xiii. 3 was *Nehemiah's* composition; and the commencement of the paragraph as far as חֲנַנְיָה (in verse 27) is certainly his. The Chronist took a passage written by Nehemiah, which he abridged and interpolated; giving it the form it now has in xii. 27-xiii. 3. Zunz supposes that "the book of the Chronicles," quoted in the twenty-third verse, means our present canonical Chronicles; which is doubtful, because the lists of priests and Levites referred to as existing in the book, are not in the Chronicles we now have. Thus xii. 27-xiii. 3 is a piece written over and elaborated by the Chronicle-writer. Some parts of it were manifestly written by Nehemiah, as the twenty-seventh from וְשִׁמְיָה to the forty-second verse. The thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth verses, where Asaph, and David the man of God appear, are Chronistic. In the forty-third verse religious joy is mentioned five times; and from the forty-fourth to the forty-seventh verses inclusive savour strongly of the

¹ Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. i. p. 308.

² Ibid.

Chronicle-writer. In xiii. 2 we have a reminiscence from Deut. xxiii. 4-6, and the appellation "book of Moses," both reminding us of the same author. The third verse does not agree with Neh. xiii. 13-27. Chronologically speaking, this piece belongs to vii. 1-4 where the walls are spoken of as completed. The dedication of them here referred to followed the finishing of the walls. The remainder of the book (xiii. 4-31) proceeded from Nehemiah himself.

From this analysis it appears, that Nehemiah himself did not write the book which now bears his name. It was compiled from his memoranda and other materials, by the writer of the Chronicles. Accordingly the time coincides with that of the Chronicles. And this is confirmed by internal evidence; for Jaddua's name occurs in xii. 11, 22, and we learn from Josephus that he was high priest when Alexander the Great visited Jerusalem. He became priest 366 B.C., Nehemiah came to Jerusalem in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes and in the priesthood of Eliashib, *i.e.*, 445. At what time he died cannot be discovered; but though Hävernicks supposes he may have seen Jaddua, it is by a combination of unlikely circumstances, such as, he was twenty years old when he came first to Jerusalem under the pontificate of Eliashib. He was contemporary with Joiada, Eliashib's son, who succeeded his father in the pontificate, and may therefore have lived in the time of Jaddua, if seventy years be added to the twenty.¹ But even this calculation does not suffice, since it brings Nehemiah only to the high priesthood of Johanan, 375 B.C.; whereas Jaddua did not become high priest till 366. We know that some have attempted to shew how much Josephus's account respecting the meeting of Alexander and Jaddua at Jerusalem abounds with historical and chronological errors. And it is probable that there is a mistake in it so far as relates to their meeting; for Onias succeeded Jaddua in the pontificate, in the first year of Alexander. But this circumstance does not affect the total improbability of Nehemiah living till the high priesthood of Jaddua; even though he died at a great age. It is just possible that Nehemiah may have lived till 370 B.C., which would make him ninety-five years old, according to Hävernicks's hypothesis respecting his age when he first came to Jerusalem; but even that date does not reach the beginning of Jaddua's high priesthood. And he must have *entered upon office* when he is spoken of in Neh. xii. 22, for the language plainly implies thus much. This mention of Jaddua brings the time of compilation within 366-332.

We are aware that the tenth and eleventh verses of Neh. xii.

¹ Einleitung, II. 1, pp. 420, 421.

in which Jaddua occurs, as also the twenty-second and twenty-third verses have been considered interpolations by many critics. The hypothesis is an arbitrary one, unless the interpolator be considered the Chronist himself working upon a previous document. As long as the verses are pronounced marginal annotations subsequently taken into the text, the statement is gratuitous.

In Neh. xii. 22 mention is made of "Darius the Persian." As Jaddua is spoken of in the same verse this can be no other than Darius Codomannus III. the last king, who began his short reign in 335 B.C. He could not be Darius Nothus who died 405 B.C., because the words in the twenty-second verse imply a later reign than his: "also the priests (the Levites just mentioned being in the days of Eliashib to Jaddua) to the reign of Darius the Persian," where though **ל** not **ל** stands, the sense is the same, and there is no necessity for supposing with Bertheau a later exchange of the one for the other. This mention of Darius brings down the composition of the work as late as 335-331 B.C. Whether the phrase, "Darius the Persian," implies that the writer or compiler lived under a non-Persian dominion, and so later than Darius Codomannus, we will not affirm. It is probable.

VL SUMMARY OF AUTHORSHIP IN THE BOOKS OF EZRA AND NEHEMIAH.—The extended work of the Chronist embraced a post-exile as well as a pre-exile part; but the former was afterwards separated from the latter and received a distinct name, the book of Ezra, including what is now Nehemiah. In this post-exile portion the Chronicle-writer copied his sources more extensively than in the preceding part. In Ezra ii. 1-69 he gave an old list; in iv. 8-vi. 18, a fragment of an Aramean narrative which he had got. In vii. 12-ix. 15 he inserted a piece of Ezra's memoirs, and in x. 18-33, he put a list or register which had come into his hands. Thus more than two-thirds of the book of Ezra was transcribed from the sources at his disposal. With respect to the book of Nehemiah which was merely intended as an appendix to the whole, he filled up gaps in Nehemiah's memoirs with vii. 73b.-ix., xii. 1-xiii. 3, and with minor interpolations besides. We have then left for the authorship of Ezra vii. 12-ix. 15, and for Neh. i. 1-vii. 73a., x. at first; xi. xiii. 4-31.

The style of Ezra in the historical part is exceedingly dry. His prayer is written in a more lively strain. The language is of a later and degenerate complexion. It is easy to account for the difference. One who had passed his earlier years in foreign lands could not be expected to write good Hebrew. In prayers

the Hebrew mind had greater facility of expression, because of its religious direction, and the help of reminiscences from the old sacred books. In point of language, Nehemiah's composition is little better than Ezra's; but his narratives are forcible and lively.

The mode of narration in the Chronicles is various according to the origin and nature of the materials employed. It is best in the parts relating to public worship, because the writer was most interested in these, and also because he could avail himself there of many old technical or characteristic expressions. Hence his style is tolerably facile. But the language is weak and degenerate. The word-forms peculiar to him are awkward and unskilful. Many of his words and grammatical constructions are half Rabbinical.

VII. THE SO-CALLED SEVENTY YEARS' CAPTIVITY IN BABYLON. —The captivity of the Jews in Babylon is commonly regarded as lasting seventy years. The destruction of Jerusalem, the death of Zedekiah, and the deportation of most of the inhabitants to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar happened either in 588 or 587 B.C., probably the latter. According to Ezra i. 1; v. 13; vi. 3; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, Cyrus gave permission to the Jews to return in the first year of his reign, *i.e.* in 538. Hence the first colony arrived in Judea in 537. Dating therefore from the destruction of Jerusalem, the exile lasted about fifty years; more exactly perhaps forty-nine, *i.e.*, from the nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar till the end of the two years' dominion of the Median king whom Cyrus set over Babylon, called by Daniel Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes. In Ptolemy's canon, however, as well as in Herodotus, no regard is paid to this short and intermediate sovereignty; so that from the nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar till the first of Cyrus is exactly forty-seven years. Ewald identifies this Darius with the Cyaxares of Xenophon. From the deportation of Jehoiachin 598 B.C. it continued about sixty-one years. How then did the opinion or tradition arise, that the captivity was of seventy years' duration? It could not have been from computation, but from Jeremiah's prophecy in xxv. 12. The number seventy in this passage stands as a round, indefinite one, meaning a long time generally. Zechariah also speaks of seventy years during which the Lord shewed His indignation against Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, using that as a round number; for in vii. 1, 5, two years later, he still speaks of seventy years. Relying on Jeremiah the Chronicle-writer also speaks of seventy years. Accordingly in Ezra iii. 12, where it is related that the first altar was erected B.C. 536, many old men were present who had seen the first house. Fifty-two years had elapsed since it was destroyed. In

accordance with this notice Haggai asks (ii. 3), "Who is left among you that saw this house in her first glory, etc.?" Sixty-seven years had elapsed; but if the exile lasted seventy years, very few persons would have survived.

Perhaps Josephus has contributed to the erroneous supposition that the captivity continued seventy years. In his *Antiquities* xi. 1, 1 he says, that the first year of Cyrus's reign was the seventieth from the day that the Jews were removed out of their own land into Babylon, etc. But he is very inconsistent, for in his treatise against Apion i. 21 we read, "in them (our books) it is written that Nebuchadnezzar, in the eighteenth year of his reign, laid our temple desolate, and so it lay in that state of obscurity for fifty years; but that in the second year of the reign of Cyrus its foundations were laid, and it was finished again in the second year of Darius." This passage makes the time in which the temple lay in ruins amount to fifty-four years and a few months. But there is reason for supposing the text of it to be corrupt. We have purposely omitted referring to Daniel ix. 25, because we do not look upon the book as authentic. Of course there is no true warrant for dating the beginning of the Babylonian captivity from 606 B.C., as Prideaux does, *i.e.* from the fourth year of Jehoiakim.¹ And the beginning of Daniel's servitude cannot be the beginning of the so-called seventy years of the Babylonish captivity. Mr. Hooper, in his learned work *Palmoni*, has thrown much light on the dates of these and other historical events.²

¹ The Old and New Testament connected, etc., vol. i. p. 62, ed. 1719.

² *Palmoni*, p. 248 et seqq.

THE BOOK OF ESTHER.

I. CONTENTS.—The book of Esther relates that Ahasuerus, who ruled over 127 provinces, made a great feast for all his nobles in his Persian capital Shushan, in the third year of his reign. It lasted 180 days; after which he made a feast for all the people present in the palace, and continued it for seven days. Vashti his queen also made a feast for the women in the royal house. On the seventh day, when the king's heart was merry with wine, he commanded his seven chamberlains to bring the queen that the people and princes might see her beauty. But she refused to come, and therefore the king was angry. On consulting the wise men respecting the proper punishment to be inflicted on her, they advised him, lest the precedent should encourage other women, to divorce Vashti and take a better. The advice was approved and adopted. Royal letters were sent into all the provinces, that every man should bear rule in his own house (i. 1-22).

After this the king's servants proposed, that fair young virgins should be gathered together out of all the provinces of the empire, in order that one might be selected for queen in place of Vashti. Now it so happened, that there was a Jew named Mordecai, a descendant of one who had been carried away captive from Jerusalem. He brought Hadassah or Esther his uncle's daughter, a fair and beautiful damsel, whom Mordecai had adopted for his own daughter. This Esther was conducted with many others to the keeper of the royal harem, where she concealed her lineage, agreeably to the caution of Mordecai. Having been presented to the king in her turn, she pleased him more than all the rest; so that he set the royal crown on her head, and made her queen instead of Vashti. Then Ahasuerus made a great feast, in honour of her coronation, accompanied with a remission of taxes to the provinces, and great gifts. In those days Mordecai discovered a conspiracy against the king's life by two of his chamberlains; and told Esther of it, who informed the king (ii. 1-23).

Long after these things, Haman an Amalekite was promoted above all the princes. By the royal command all the king's servants who were about the court bowed and did him homage as he passed, with the exception of Mordecai. The latter, though repeatedly spoken to by his associates, gave no heed to their remonstrances, which led to their telling Haman of the disrespect, as also of Mordecai's Jewish birth. Haman was therefore greatly incensed, and meditated the destruction of all the Jews throughout the kingdom. The lot was cast before him from day to day for nearly twelve months, till Adar seemed the month pointed out by the divination as most suitable for the execution of his purpose. He then informed the king that a people were dispersed throughout the empire whose laws were different from those of all other nations, who did not observe the king's laws, and ought not to be allowed to exist. It was proposed that they should be destroyed. Haman engaged to pay 10,000 talents of silver into the royal treasury. To this the king agreed. Letters were sent, bearing the royal signature and seal, into all the provinces of the kingdom to destroy all the Jews indiscriminately, of every age and sex, in one day—the 13th of the twelfth month—and to seize their property. After the posts went out, the king and Haman sat down to drink; but the city Shushan was perplexed (iii. 1-15).

When Mordecai perceived what was done, he put on sackcloth with ashes, and went crying bitterly through the city till he came before the king's gate. Informed by her attendants of his presence and attire, Esther was exceedingly grieved, and sent raiment to clothe him, which he refused to put on. One of the chamberlains having been despatched to inquire what was the matter, Mordecai told him of all that had happened; gave him a copy of the royal decree commanding the extirpation of his people, and sent a pressing request to Esther that she should supplicate her royal husband on behalf of the Jews. But she sent back word that to go unsummoned into the king's presence was a capital offence—except the king stretched out the golden sceptre in token of forgiveness. He returned in answer that her own fate was bound up with the sentence proclaimed against her kindred; that deliverance might happen from some other quarter; and that perhaps she had been elevated for the very purpose of saving her nation at such a crisis. In consequence of this message she requested Mordecai to have all the Jews in Shushan gathered together to keep fast for three days on her account; intimating at the same time that she and her maidens would fast before she went in to the king at the risk of her life (iv. 1-17).

The third day after, Esther, clothed in royal apparel, pre-

CONTENTS.

sented herself before the king. She was graciously received—Ahasuerus holding out to her the golden sceptre, whose top she touched. When asked what was her request, and having received the promise of it, should it even amount to the half of the kingdom, she requested that the king and Haman might come that day to a banquet prepared. At table the king asked again what was her petition. This she promised to make known on the morrow, if the king and Haman would honour her with their presence at another banquet on that day. As Haman went forth with a glad heart from the royal presence, and saw Mordecai who paid him no reverence, he was incensed against him, but refrained from violence. After he went home he called his friends together and his wife, whom he told of all his wealth, and children, and honours; how he had sat with the king and queen, and was again to be at the royal table the next day. "Yet all this," he said, "availeth me nothing, so long as I see Mordecai sitting at the king's gate." By the counsel of his wife and friends, he had a gallows erected, and was to apply the next day for the king's order to have Mordecai hanged on it (v. 1-14).

On that night the king could not sleep; and to relieve the tediousness of the time he commanded the book of the record of the chronicles to be brought, which was read before him. After hearing of the good service done him by Mordecai when two chamberlains plotted against his life, he inquired what reward had been received for it. Being told that no requital had been made, he inquired what courtier was in attendance, and was told that Haman was in the court, who was summoned into the royal presence, and commanded to give his advice as to what should be done to the man whom the king delighted to honour. Thinking such a man to be none other than himself, he counselled the king to have him robed in the royal apparel, the crown put on his head, mounted on the king's horse, and conducted through the street of the city by one of the king's most noble princes, proclaiming before him, "Thus shall it be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honour." The king acting immediately on this advice, ordered Haman to do all this to Mordecai the Jew. After it was done, Haman returned to his home full of envy and malice, where he told his wife and friends of all that had happened (vi. 1-13).

While the conference was proceeding at his house, the royal chamberlains came to conduct him to the queen's banquet, where, after the king's inquiry had been repeated, Esther said that she preferred her suit for her own life and her people's who were sentenced to die. If bondage only had been determined upon for them, she would not have ventured to intercede for

them. After the king asked who and where the man was that durst presume in his heart to do so, and had received the answer that *Haman* was the wicked enemy, he rose up angry and went to the palace garden; while *Haman* begged his life from the queen. Returning from the garden, he was the more enraged at what appeared to him *Haman's* improper familiarity with *Esther*; and being informed of the gallows erected in *Haman's* house for *Mordecai*, ordered him to be hanged on it (vi. 14-vii. 10).

Ahasuerus gave all that *Haman* had to his queen, who appointed *Mordecai* the administrator of it, after he had appeared in the royal presence and received the king's ring as the token of his authority. In the mean time, *Esther* had told her royal husband of the relationship between her and *Mordecai*. Still however the letters devised by *Haman* remained in force; and therefore *Esther* besought the king with tears to avert the mischief. As it was considered among the Persians that what was written in the king's name and sealed with his ring was irreversible, *Ahasuerus* ordered *Mordecai* to send letters by post on horseback, authorising the Jews to gather themselves together and defend their lives against every one who should assault them, as also to destroy and kill all the people who, by attacking, should expose themselves to danger. *Mordecai* went forth with great honour from the royal presence, the city of *Shusan* rejoiced, and the Jews were glad throughout all the realm, wherever the king's decree came (viii. 1-17).

On the thirteenth day of the month *Adar*, the day appointed for the execution of the king's decree against the Jews, this people gathered together in their cities throughout all the provinces of the empire, to fall upon such as sought their hurt. No man could withstand them. The principal men of the provinces helped the Jews, because the fear of *Mordecai* had affected them. All the enemies of the Jews were smitten with a great destruction. In *Shushan* the palace, 500 men were slain and destroyed, besides the ten sons of *Haman*; but the spoil was not touched. On the number of those slain in *Shushan* being brought before *Ahasuerus*, he asked *Esther* what farther she would have. She requested that the slaughter should be renewed next day, and that *Haman's* ten sons should be hanged on the gallows. This was done accordingly; and 300 more were slain in *Shushan*. The Jews in the provinces slew 75,000, and, like those in the capital, touched nothing of the prey. In the villages they rested on the 14th of *Adar*, making it a day of feasting and gladness. But those in *Shushan* rested on the 15th day, which they celebrated as a festival, like their brethren in the provinces (ix. 1-19).

After this, Mordecai wrote to all the Jews far and near throughout the empire to make the celebration perpetual from year to year, on the 14th and 15th days of Adar. This was done, and the days were called *Purim*, after the name of Pur; because Haman had cast *the lot* to destroy them. Then Esther and Mordecai wrote with all authority to confirm these days of Purim (ix. 20-32).

Ahasuerus laid a tribute upon the land and the isles of the sea. And all the acts of his power and the declaration of Mordecai's greatness were written in the book of the chronicles of the Kings of Media and Persia (x. 1-3).

II. SCOPE OF THE BOOK.—The scope of the work is to relate the historical occasion of the feast of *Purim* or lots, which is to the Jews what the *Saturnalia* was to the Romans; and is celebrated on the 14th and 15th days of the month Adar. It is not to illustrate the providence of God towards his Church, though that is signally displayed in the remarkable deliverance of the Jews recorded; nor is it to encourage the Jews after their return to Palestine to lean more fully on the promises relating to the Messiah who was to appear, and to promote the restoration of their ecclesiastical and civil polity, as Carpzov thinks.¹

III. THE AHASUERUS OF THE BOOK.—Great difference of opinion has existed respecting the Ahasuerus of the book. He was not Cambyses; because the length of his reign forbids: nor Darius the Mede, who, after subduing Babylon and enlarging his territories, lived no more than two years. Nor was he Astyages, Darius's father-in-law, because the extent of Ahasuerus's empire does not agree with the small dominion belonging to Astyages. Nor does Artaxerxes Longimanus suit; though Josephus, Petavius, Lightfoot, Le Clerc, Prideaux, Hales, and others fix upon him. The favour shewn to the Jews by him, above all other kings that reigned in Persia, is not a proof that they had in his days such an advocate as Esther to intercede for them. In the book of Nehemiah it is never hinted that his queen was a Jewess, though she is mentioned (ii. 6). And the character of Artaxerxes does not accord with that of Ahasuerus in this book. Still less will any other Artaxerxes agree; whether Mnemon, as Jerome and Eusebius suppose; or Ochus, as L. Capellus conjectures. The name Artaxerxes is always written in Scripture *Artachshasta*, not Ahasuerus. Besides, chronology does not allow of the hypothesis. Others think that Darius Hystaspis is meant; and identify Esther with his wife Atossa. But no Darius is ever called Ahasuerus in Scripture, though the name often occurs. Atossa had four sons by Darius, all born

¹ Introductio, Part I. p. 365.

after he had ascended the throne; and therefore she could not be queen Vashti whom the king divorced in the third year of his reign. It is true that Ahasuerus is said to have laid a tribute on the land and the isles (Esther x.), and that the same is said of Darius Hystaspis by Herodotus; but Strabo ascribes this to Darius Longimanus; and it seems that Darius is there put by mistake of the transcribers for Artaxerxes. Neither Darius Hystaspis's character, nor his conduct towards the Jews, corresponds with what the book of Esther relates of Ahasuerus. The names of his counsellors in Herodotus are not the same as the names of them here. We cannot, therefore, assent to this view, though it is held by Ussher, Dupin, F. Spanheim, Luther, and others. Nor was he Cyaxares, the son of Phraortes, as Nickes¹ tries to shew. The only probable opinion is that which identifies Ahasuerus with Xerxes; as Joseph Scaliger, Drusius, Pfeiffer, Dannhauer, Carpzov, Justi, Jahn, Eichhorn, Gesenius, and most modern critics believe.

The point is ably argued, and the objections to Xerxes well answered by Herzfeld.² The extent of Ahasuerus's empire (from India even unto Ethiopia, 127 provinces, i. 1) is said by Herodotus in nearly the same words to have belonged to Xerxes.³ The time of his reign in which the banquet was held, viz., the third year, agrees well with the meeting together of the nobles and princes of the Persian empire at which the invasion of Greece was decided upon. The divorce of his queen in the same year, and Esther's elevation four years after, are also suitable, in the opinion of some, to Xerxes's history; the intermediate time having been spent in preparations for war and in the expedition itself—for the monarch did not return to Susa till the seventh year of his reign, not the tenth, as Herodotus states. But the correspondence is not good in these particulars. We are unable to follow Scaliger and others in identifying Esther with Amestris, Xerxes's queen, who caused the wife of Masistes to be horribly mutilated; and fourteen children of the best families in Persia to be buried alive as a sacrifice to the infernal gods.⁴ It is possible indeed that tradition may have transformed her person and conduct, when taken into the circle of Jewish history by representing her as a protectress of the Jews and cruel only to the Persians; but the metamorphosis is too great to be assumed with probability. What most favours the identity of Xerxes with Ahasuerus is *similarity of character*.

¹ De Estherae libro et ad eum quae pertinent vaticiniis et psalmis, libri tres. Pars prior, 1856.

² Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. ii. p. 359 et seqq.

³ Lib. vii. cap. 9.

⁴ Ibid, chaps. 107, 112.

The conduct of Xerxes was capricious, and in some cases like that of a madman. His disposition was sensual and cruel. He was prone to indulge in riotous living. His measures were often sudden and arbitrary. All this is reflected in the person of Ahasuerus better than in that of any other Persian monarch we know. It is objected, however, that Xerxes ascended the throne in the year 485 B.C., *i.e.*, 112 years after the captivity of Jeconiah, in which Mordecai is said to have been carried to Babylon; but the objection is pointless, because Mordecai's great grandfather, not himself, is said to have been carried away prisoner with Jeconiah.

It may be thought that Xerxes is also objectionable on the score of chronology, if he reigned only eleven or twelve years as Hengstenberg and Krüger think. But even if the attempted proof of this opinion were successful, Xerxes is not unsuitable to the history in Esther, because the latter ends with the twelfth year of that monarch. It is still most probable that Xerxes reigned twenty-one years;¹ and Artabanus had not control over him till the latter part of his reign, when he abandoned himself to the indulgence of his lusts, and neglected public affairs.

We do not pretend to say that *everything* in the book attributed to Ahasuerus corresponds with the character and conduct of Xerxes. The parallel between them cannot be fully carried out. But this serves among other things to shew the improbability of all being true history. As some of it is fabulous, we are left without the means of determining its general correspondence with known history. The author may have written without strict regard to persons and characters, putting into the shape that seemed best a story connected with the origin of an ancient festival.

IV. HISTORICAL IMPROBABILITIES.—The historical character of the book has been called in question by many, because of the numerous and great improbabilities contained in it. Let us see what they are.

1. Ahasuerus keeps a feast for half a year, assembling about him all his princes, nobles, and satraps, and thus leaving their provinces without a proper government.

Apologists account for this by saying that after the termination of his campaign against Egypt, he summoned all the great men of his kingdom to Susa, in the third year of his reign, to consult with them respecting an expedition against Greece. Hence the half-year feast, because the deliberations were so important. It is true that the Persian kings were accustomed to hold councils of their nobles on affairs of state; but how can

¹ Herzfeld's *Geschichte des V. Israel*, vol. ii. pp. 397, 398.

the six months' duration of such consultations be accounted for? Is it at all likely that the provinces would be left without government for so long a time? The writer of the book makes no mention of these deliberations; which is not singular because they had no relation to his purpose; but that they should continue so long is unaccountable.

2. The divorce of Vashti takes place in the third year of Xerxes' reign, soon after which measures were adopted for the selection of a queen in her stead. But the selection of Esther is not mentioned till towards the end of the *seventh* year of his reign.

Apologists explain this fact by saying that the intermediate period was occupied by the expedition against Greece, whence Xerxes returned in the spring of the seventh year of his reign. In consequence of this, his marriage was postponed, the virgins already gathered together dismissed, and brought again into the royal harem, after the return from Greece. Hence it is written in ii. 19, "when the virgins were gathered together *the second time*," etc.¹ This answer is insufficient, because Herodotus relates² that while Xerxes resided at Sardis his queen was Amestris, whose cruel disposition and deeds to the innocent forbid the idea of her identity with Esther. We are reminded indeed that all the Persian kings had more wives than one; but how could Xerxes have had at the same time both Amestris and Esther, if what is said by Herodotus of the former's power over him and her jealousy, be true? And as Amestris was his queen before he returned to Susa from the Grecian expedition, whereas Vashti was divorced before the expedition commenced, it appears that Amestris had succeeded Vashti. Indeed it is unlikely that the monarch waited till after his return. In any case, two *queens* at the same time are out of the question.

3. When Vashti refuses to appear before the king and his princes, the latter advise him to enact, and he proceeds with all due form to put the counsel into execution and to send letters into all the provinces of the empire, according to the dialect of each one, that *every man should bear rule in his own house*. Surely this was an unnecessary and absurd thing, in an Oriental country at that day.

4. Mordecai was carried captive with Jehoiachin 597 B.C.; Xerxes did not begin his reign till 485 B.C.; and the third year of that reign when Vashti was rejected, must bring Mordecai to the age of 115, even if he was carried away in infancy. At that time his niece Esther was not a young virgin, as the book represents her, but must have lost her personal charms through

¹ See Keil's *Einleitung*, p. 471.

² Lib. ix. cæpp. 108-110.

age. This argument though adduced by De Wette and others, does not appear to be valid.

The true explanation of the original words makes Kish, great grandfather of Mordecai, the person carried away in Jehoiachin's captivity. The text runs thus: "Now in Shushan the palace there was a certain Jew whose name was Mordecai, the son of Jair, the son of Shimei, the son of Kish, a Benjamite, who had been carried away from Jerusalem with the captivity which had been carried away with Jecōniah king of Judah, whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon had carried away. And he brought up Hadassah, that is Esther, his uncle's daughter, etc. (ii. 5-7). Here **כיש**, *who*, at the beginning of the sixth verse refers to the immediate antecedent *Kish*; and so the time of Mordecai may be placed where the genealogy demands.¹ The Hebrew is certainly open to either construction; but we cannot affirm that it is as naturally open to either in the present instance. With regard to this point, the defenders of the historical correctness of the whole narrative disagree among themselves; Justi, Baumgarten and others rightly referring the pronoun to the great grandfather of Mordecai; while Nickes insists upon the antecedent being Mordecai himself.²

5. Haman, because of an affront from one Jew, maliciously designs to destroy a whole nation of about two millions of people; and the king at once agrees to his request that the slaughter should take place; while he offers the monarch 10,000 talents of silver, equal to nearly three millions sterling and a half. This is somewhat incredible on the part of the king and prime minister.

6. Haman's decree for the extermination of the Jews was issued on the 13th day of the month Adar, but was not to be executed till the 13th day of the twelfth month. Thus the whole kingdom is advertised eleven months before of the intended massacre. What monarch would have given such public notice of a bloody decree he intended to execute, instead of communicating it privately to the presidents of the provinces? And the people destined for the slaughter are represented in the mean time as quietly awaiting their fate, without preparing to flee, or to defend themselves.

The solution of this has been sought in the circumstance that Haman cast lots for a lucky day, and could not change it when it was once fixed by lot. His superstition did not allow of a change. Surely a man bent on the destruction of two millions of people, would not have permitted a superstition to stand in the way of its fulfilment! When the choice was between its

¹ Baumgarten de fide libri Estheræ, p. 127.

² Comp. Ewald, neuntes Jahrbuch, p. 187.

taking place or not, he would not hesitate to adopt the course likely to effect his object. Judea itself was at that time a Persian province, and was inhabited almost entirely by Jews. Hence Ahasuerus would have decreed the slaughter of by far the greater number of the inhabitants of one of his provinces, and announced the decree, too, nearly twelve months before the intended execution of it. Surely this is incredible!

7. The king, after changing his mind, authorises the Jews when assailed to arm themselves and kill his native subjects; and those subjects, knowing the second decree to this effect, provoke and assail them according to the first decree. Hence above 75,000 Persians after eight months' warning are slaughtered, without mention of any Jews being destroyed. Not a single Jew is said to have been wounded, much less killed. The history represents the Persians as passive victims. The fear of the Jews fell upon and paralysed all people: it is even said that the rulers of the provinces and other officers helped the foreigners against their own fellow-countrymen because they were afraid of Mordecai the grand Vizier. The number slain is quite improbable, notwithstanding all the supposable and supposed circumstances of the case. Although the prime minister and the queen were Jews; although the people were widely diffused through the Persian empire at the time, and were aided by the Persian rulers, the improbability is not removed. It is true, as has been said by way of lessening the peculiarities of the narrative, that the fact of no harm being mentioned as sustained by the Jews, does not prove that none was done; but, at the same time, the general impression which a reader derives from the narrative is, that the Jews suffered no hurt. "They smote all their enemies with the stroke of the sword, and slaughter, and destruction, and did what they would unto those that hated them" (ix. 5).

8. The king, at the request of Esther, allows another day for the butchery in the palace; although he had just learned that 500 had been already slain there, and the ten sons of Haman. This looks very improbable.

9. How could the city Shushan generally be "perplexed" by the first edict which Haman obtained; or how could it be thrown into such gladness by the second (iii. 15; viii. 15)? Was the city inhabited by Jews alone? The residence of the kings, and the capital of the province Susiana, must have been chiefly occupied by Persians, not Jews; and as its circumference, according to Strabo, was 120 stadia, it could not generally be thrown into trouble by the one edict, or into delight by the other.

10. It is somewhat improbable that Vashti should have been

summoned by the king to the banquet, and not to the carousal. Such was not the Persian custom. But perhaps the character of Xerxes may account for this.

11. It is very unlikely that so great honour should be shewn to Mordecai for his discovery of a conspiracy against the king's life which had passed unrewarded for a while, as that the royal crown should be set on his head, the royal apparel put on him, the king's charger given him to ride upon, and he himself be conducted in royal state through the streets of the city. The evidence of Jewish pride is seen in this narrative.

12. The existence of a plot against the king's life having been discovered by Mordecai seems improbable, unless he were immediately elevated and rewarded. Such services were well-requited.

13. The description of Ahasuerus's sitting on his throne when he did not give audience to any one, and so exhibiting his royal pomp when there was no occasion, is incongruous. And that the queen could only approach to speak to her husband at the risk of her life is improbable, unless she had fallen under the monarch's displeasure. Who can think it agreeable to Persian manners that the king should have continually a golden sceptre at hand to reach forth to any one whom he might allow to speak to him without having been summoned?

Some of these difficulties in the narrative may perhaps be solved by Xerxes' weak, capricious, proud, and mad-like disposition. One who wrote to mount Athos in high-sounding terms of command; who ordered 300 stripes to be inflicted on the sea and a pair of fetters thrown into it; who had the heads of the persons who built the bridge of boats between Sestos and Abydos struck off after the storm had shattered the vessels of which it was composed; and who gave himself to the gratification of his lusts and vicious inclinations, cannot be judged by the ordinary standard of humanity.

14. The gallows erected by Haman is said to have been fifty cubits high (seventy-five feet at the lowest computation), and in Haman's own house (vii. 9). This is most improbable.

15. It is very singular, that Mordecai himself institutes the feast of *Purim*, without any mention of the Jerusalem Jews and the high priest, whose consent to such an institution could hardly be dispensed with.

16. The sleeplessness of the king and his reading in the book of chronicles on the very night before Mordecai's intended execution (vi. 1-13) is somewhat unlikely. So providential a thing may indeed have happened; but it is surrounded with suspicious circumstances. And why should the royal favourite and prime minister or vizier of the monarch have needed

the king's permission to put an obscure man like Mordecai to death?

17. It would appear from vi. 13, as if the wise men had heard for the first time from Haman that Mordecai was a Jew, which does not agree with what is already related in iii. 6-7.¹

In consequence of these phenomena we cannot regard the book as containing only true history. Neither can it be accounted pure fiction. Rather does true history lie at its foundation, dressed out with a number of imaginary details and circumstances. The basis is true; but a good part of the superstructure, and the air thrown over it, are fabulous. As the feast of *Purim* has been observed from a very early time by the Jews, being mentioned in the second book of Maccabees and Josephus, it cannot well be denied that it was instituted at first to commemorate some national deliverance. The Jews in Persia were saved from some terrible persecution which threatened them. The government of the country, at the instigation of a prime minister or vizier, was about to order, or had ordered their destruction, from which they were marvellously saved. This event was handed down orally, and embellished in the course of time with fictitious features, till it was reduced to writing in its present form. Of course it is now impossible to separate the fabulous from the real; but we cannot help thinking that the latter is small in comparison with the former. The basis is narrow; the superstructure ample. Stähelin's apologetic remarks, gathered out of Hävernicks and others, are very insufficient proof of the historical credibility of all which the book contains.²

In 2 Maccabees xv. 36, *Mardocheus's day* is mentioned—one day. But Josephus states that the 14th and 15th of Adar were kept sacred. This latter agrees with the Megillath Taanith (cap. 12). The Mishna gives the 14th Adar as kept by some Jews, and the 15th by others, coinciding with Esther ix. 18, 19. The 13th Adar as a *fast-day* was connected with the Purim feast in comparatively recent times. Bertheau³ conjectures that it was brought into such relation after the ninth century, when the day of Nicanor (the 13th Adar) had fallen into oblivion. The 13th of a month seems to have been the original day on which was kept a festival that was widened in its significance before the present book was written, and perhaps brought into connection with the passover, as a festival preparatory to it, and just a month earlier.⁴

It is scarcely worth while to mention Nickes's vain attempt

¹ See De Wette's *Einleitung*, p. 294 et seqq., and Bleek, p. 404 et seqq.

² *Specielle Einleitung*, §§ 51, 52.

³ *Exeget. Handbuch*, xvii. p. 285.

⁴ Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Is.* vol. iv. pp. 260, 261.

to prop up the historical accuracy of everything related in the book by imagining allusions to it in passages contained in the Psalms, Prophets, and earlier books. The very mention of the following places which he quotes, Gen. xxvii. 40, xlviii. 27; Ex. xvii. 14-16; Num. xxiv. 7, 20; Deut. iv. 26-30; Hosea i. 10; ii. 13-24; Isaiah xiii. 20; Psalms xi. xiii. xxii. xxviii. is enough to shew the utter baselessness of his reasoning.

V. INTEGRITY.—Both the language and contents of ix. 20-32, appear to separate it from the preceding and following contexts. Unusual diction and difficult constructions present themselves. The section properly consists of two small pieces, viz., 20-28 and 29-32. In the former it is said that Mordecai wrote these things, and sent letters to all the Jews to establish among them the yearly keeping of the 14th and 15th days of Adar; which the Jews accordingly did, as they had already begun. In the latter (29-32), Esther and Mordecai write a second letter, that all the Jews should observe the 14th and 15th of Adar as days of rejoicing. The words of the twentieth verse, "And Mordecai wrote these things and sent letters unto all the Jews that were in all the provinces of the king Ahasuerus," etc., refer only to what Mordecai wrote to the Jews throughout the empire about keeping the two days; not to his writing the book of Esther, whether from i. 1 to ix. 19, or the whole. In like manner, the letter spoken of in ver. 26 was not the present book of Esther. The epistle, such as it was, is not given; its purport alone is noticed. It may be perhaps that ver. 24 and 25 are a short extract from it. The contents of the first appendix, ix. 20-29, do not agree well with the preceding narrative of the book. We learn from ix. 15-19 that some of the Jews kept the 15th of Adar, others the 14th; whereas it is said in the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth verses that both days "should be remembered and kept throughout every generation, every family, every province, and every city," etc. We agree with Herzfeld that in ver. 21, 27, 28, 31, the days should not be taken *distributedly*; but at the same time it is plainly asserted in the preceding verses that the Jews in unwallied towns celebrated the 14th of Adar, and those in Susa the 15th. The acute Rabbi has not succeeded in reconciling the different statements; for an appeal to some copies of the Septuagint (the Cod. Alexandr., as well as the Comptutensian and Aldine editions) which add to ix. 19, that the Jews of the metropolis celebrated the 15th of Adar also, is founded on nothing but an unauthentic addition to the text.¹ The twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses represent Haman as devising a plot to slay all the Jews; but as soon as

¹ Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. ii. p. 364.

the king heard of it, he wrote to the effect that he and his sons should be hanged. This differs from the narrative of the book, and cannot be altogether accounted for from brevity. The object of the letter spoken of in the second appendix (29-32) was to "confirm these days of Purim in their times appointed, according as Mordecai the Jew and Esther the queen had enjoined them, and as they had decreed for themselves and for their seed, the matters of the fasting and of their cry" (31). No mention of such decrees or prescriptions occurs in i. 1-ix. 19. The terms "second letter" (29) presuppose an acquaintance with the first—that in ver. 26. And as mention of *the book* occurs in ver. 32, where the present book of Esther cannot be meant, another book of Purim is implied, from which these two appendixes, 20-28 and 29-32 were taken. This book purported to have been written by Mordecai, and contained an account of the origin of the festival, with the two letters here referred to.

At what time the small pieces in question were inserted into Esther out of another Purim book cannot be discovered. Probably no long time intervened—not a century.¹

Bleek thinks it possible that the festival had at first a somewhat different or more general significance, referring perhaps to the deliverance of the people from exile or something similar. A later representation may have given it the definite allusion it now bears to a single deliverance, such as is described in the book. The name פִּרְיָם, obscure in itself, is here explained after the Persian as *lots*, and derived from the lot cast by Haman to fix the time for destroying the Jews (iii. 7, ix. 24). But what is told of Haman's casting lots is something unessential to the occurrence itself, which could hardly come to be known generally, especially by the Jews; so that it is very doubtful whether the derivation of the name be really historical or authentic. Such is the opinion of Bleek²—a truth-loving critic who deserves to be placed by the side of De Wette for all the qualities of head and heart indicative of greatness.

Ewald calls attention to the book of Tobit i. 21, in which Achiacharus is spoken of, and one Amōn besides (xiv. 10). The former was a Jew, who had a high place at the Assyrian court, like Mordecai at the Persian, and was supported by Aman.³ It might therefore be conjectured that the dispute between Achiacharus and Aman was transferred from the Assyrian to the Persian period, and became one between Mordecai and Haman. We must confess, however, with Bertheau, that the original identity of the two events is not probable.

¹ Bertheau, Exeget. Handbuch, xvii. p. 277, et seqq.

² Einleitung, p. 408.

³ Geschichte des V. Israel, vol. iv. pp. 237, 238.

VI. AUTHOR AND AGE.—De Wette thinks¹ that the book *intentionally* gives the idea of its being the work of Mordecai; and this opinion is mentioned by Aben Ezra, Herzfeld, and others. It is based on ix. 20, "And Mordecai wrote these things, and sent letters unto all the Jews that were in all the provinces of the king Ahasuerus, both nigh and far;" and in ix. 32, "And the decree of Esther confirmed these matters of Purim; and it was written in the book." But it appears to us that the only proper inference from both passages is, that the author gives us to understand that his narrative rests on a written source; not that Mordecai was the author of the work, but of the letter to the Jews directing them to keep the fourteenth day as a feast. There is no foundation for the opinion that Mordecai wrote the book; especially as we do not know how far the narrative respecting him is historical. It is also a groundless conjecture to affirm that Ezra, or the men of the great synagogue, wrote it. It is very difficult to decide whether the writer lived in Persia or Palestine when he wrote. For the former it may be argued, that the chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia are quoted (x. 2); and that an accurate knowledge of Susa, and of the Persian empire, with its manners and customs, is shewn. Thus Ahasuerus is said to have reigned from India to Ethiopia; the palace at Shushan and its magnificence are referred to; the wise men or Magi are consulted respecting affairs of the kingdom; the seven princes of Media and Persia form a council of state, who see the king's face and sit first in the kingdom; homage is paid to the vizier as representative of the king; the royal swift posts carry into all the provinces edicts sealed with the king's seal: extravagant honours are heaped on such as saved the king's life; these and other characteristic traits manifest a good acquaintance with Persia. In like manner, the absence of all reference to Judah and Jerusalem, as well as of the theocratic spirit may betray the strong influence of a foreign locality. Yet it may be said on the other hand, that this knowledge of Persian manners and customs might have been acquired by one in Judea; which is strengthened by the fact that the writer betrays occasional errors and incongruities in the things mentioned, and inserts here and there explanations of Persian customs, as in viii. 8 and i. 13. Such notices are incompatible with the assumption of the book being of Persian origin. We can hardly think of a Jew in Persia writing principally for his Palestinian brethren; nor can it well be supposed that they would have taken his production into the canon under such circumstances. In either case, the absence of the theocratic spirit remains to be accounted for by the writer's own idiosyncrasy.

¹ Einleitung, p. 297.

It is difficult, too, to discover the time when the author lived. The probability is, that the Persian monarchy had fallen. The days of Ahasuerus, "who reigned from India even unto Ethiopia," seem to have been long past, else it was superfluous to state the extent of his dominions. With this agrees the spirit of revenge and cruelty which appears in the book—a spirit prevalent in the times of the Seleucidæ and Ptolemies, *i.e.*, after 312 B.C. Esther is not content with one day's slaughter in the palace of Shushan, though 500 had been massacred; she requested an order for a similar carnage on the following day (ix. 12, 13). The bodies of Haman's ten sons must be hanged on the gallows (ix. 13). Such a spirit among Jews was nurtured under the Ptolemies, when the chosen people were trodden down and cruelly treated. We cannot therefore place the composition, with Hävernicks and Welte, under Artaxerxes 464-424 B.C.; but somewhere about 300-290 B.C., *i.e.*, under Ptolemy Lagi. This date is adopted by Bertholdt, Gesenius, De Wette, Meier, and Herzfeld. It is in harmony with the very late character of the language. Words, forms, and expressions occur belonging not only to the time when the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles were composed, but also to an age somewhat later. While terms common to them all are found, there are some peculiar to the book itself. Ecclesiastes comes nearest to it, in lateness of phraseology. As might have been expected, there are *Persian* terms. Others betraying a Chaldaising period are such as **מֶאֱמָר** for **אָמַר** *word*, *command*, i. 15, ii. 20, ix. 32. **אַבְדָן** *destruction*, ix. 5. **אַבְדָן** *destruction*, viii. 6. **הַצִּלָה** *deliverance*, iv. 14. **יִשָּׁט** *to extend*, iv. 11, v. 2, viii. 4. **אָנַם** *to compel*, i. 8. **אֵלֵּי** *though*, vii. 4. **רַב** for **שָׂר** *officer*, i. 8; *Dan.* i. 3, etc. **בֵּיתָן** *house or palace*, i. 5, vii. 7, 8. **כֶּתֶר** *crown*, i. 11, ii. 17, vi. 8. Persian words are **פָּרְתִּים** *nobles*, i. 3. **פֶּתֶנָם** *decree*, i. 20.

It agrees with the very late date assigned to the book that it was handled with considerable freedom, like others belonging to the same period. Additions were made to it which would not have been attached to the old sacred books to which centuries had imparted a character of completeness and relative perfection. The contents and tendency of the additions which were made to Esther at an early period probably arose from a desire to give the work a tone of piety.

VII. ABSENCE OF A RELIGIOUS SPIRIT.—The absence of a religious as well as a theocratic spirit in the book is very remarkable. The name of God never occurs. There is no reference to a superintending providence, although the events recorded

shew it so remarkably. The Jews were delivered from an undeserved and indiscriminate destruction by means which human forethought could not have devised. Their salvation was almost miraculous. Instead of being slaughtered by their enemies, their enemies were put to death by them. The history is pregnant with the manifestations of an overruling providence. Yet there is no recognition of the Supreme One, to whom the old covenant people owed their preservation. No gratitude is expressed for His favour. Indeed there is an entire suppression of the religious spirit; the events being described in the cold manner of a secular writer whose philosophy rises no higher than the outward phenomena around him. The only signs of piety observable are the fasting of all the Jews in Shushan three days and nights on behalf of Esther's undertaking, accompanied with the same thing on the part of herself and maidens. The queen attributes an extraordinary value to this; a sure token of decaying spiritual life. So also do Mordecai and all the Jews, who, hearing of Haman's decree against them, put on sackcloth and ashes, fast, weep, and wail. Not a word is said of their prayers to Jehovah to avert the impending calamity. All that Mordecai, Esther, and the other Jews do, evinces little faith in One who is their great king and covenant-keeping God. It shews an undue reliance on dead forms of asceticism.

Baumgarten¹ and Keil² explain the remarkable fact to which we are alluding by the strict fidelity of the writer, who did not wish to depict the leading persons as more devout than they were. Had he set forth the events in a religious point of view, it would have appeared strange to his contemporaries and foreign to the subject; since Jehovah the God of Israel had not revealed himself to the Persian people. Accordingly, it is thought that he contented himself with a bare narration of facts; abstaining from any reflections on them, and suppressing his own subjectivity. The view of Hävernicks is not materially different; only that he assumes on the part of the writer and his countrymen in Persia a consciousness of being forsaken by God, which he did not wish hypocritically to conceal, or to throw a strange colouring over the events.³ All such justification of the historian's spirit is insufficient. If he were a religious man, how could he refrain from mentioning the name of God; or omit all expression of thankfulness to Him as the preserver of the Jews? No historic fidelity would be violated by such acknowledgment. The principal persons who figure in the history would appear in all their naturalness, were the narrator to introduce an occasional remark indicative of his grateful feelings to God the

¹ De fide libri Estheræ, etc., p. 56 et seqq.

² Einleit. II. 1, pp. 358, 359.

³ Einleitung, p. 474.

deliverer of his people. It is not necessary that the actors themselves should be made to express any such feelings, if *the writer* do so. A consciousness of being forsaken by God, is scarcely consistent with the events related; unless the author were absolutely dead to every religious sentiment. And all the post-exile books exhibit no such sense of desertion. On the contrary, they shew a reviving religiousness. We cannot suppose that the spirit of Judaism is fairly represented in the writer—a spirit characterised by devoutness and thankfulness to Jehovah. If he had thought rightly of the great deliverance he describes, it would have been spoken of in a very different way. But his devotion was well nigh extinct; if indeed it ever existed. And this fact strengthens our belief that he lived a very considerable time after the events narrated. The longer the interval between the captivity of Jehoiachin and the age of the writer is supposed to be, the more probable does the absence of the religious spirit appear. We suppose the space of two centuries intervened; whereas Hävernicks assumes upwards of a century. The latter is a less natural view on account of its very shortness. In either case, it is incorrect to say that the fact of Mordecai and Esther having written to all the Jewish communities in the Persian empire, must have been known as true or false at the time the Old Testament was settled, and its untruth would have sufficed to exclude the book from the collection. Another mode of accounting for the omission of the name of God is to regard the book as a translated extract from the annals of Ahasuerus' reign. The book attests the existence of such historical records (ii. 23; vi. 1; x. 2); and it is well known that Asiatic sovereigns generally had annals of their reigns preserved. Supposing then it were necessary that the Jews should have a faithful narrative of what befel them under queen Esther, they could derive it from no better source than from the memoirs of her consort. By this means various phenomena in the book are supposed to be accounted for, such as, that the Jews are mentioned only in the third person, and Mordecai is styled "the Jew." It is also alleged, that if the author of the extract had given it a more Jewish complexion—if he had spoken of the God of Israel; instead of making his narrative more credible he would have deteriorated its internal truthfulness.

This is an ingenious hypothesis; but destitute of all probability, as we conceive. The work is a translation from the Persian, and nothing more. Esther, Ezra, or Mordecai had authority enough to obtain such an extract. So it is alleged. But by whom was it made? Was it by a Jew or a Persian? Doubtless by a Jew. Why then is the form of the language not more

Persised? And what reason or necessity was there for confining himself to a bare extract? Surely such a production was not a very likely thing to be included among the canonical books by the Palestinian Jews. An extract from the Persian annals could hardly have recorded many things in the book; such as Mordecai's message and replies to Esther in the fourth chapter, and Haman's conferences at home with his wife and friends. The history is too minute and desultory to be an extract from Persian memoirs. *The monarch's* doings and sayings are principally recorded in such writings; not those of individuals afterwards degraded and hanged, as Haman was. Besides, the references to the chronicles of the kings of Persia in ii. 23; vi. 1; x. 2, seem to be imitated from similar notices in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Instead of being independent testimony to the fact that the occurrences of the book were partly or wholly written in the royal chronicles, they are the author's imitation of what he found in the prior literature of his people. In fact, the tone of it is not Persian but Jewish. "This man Mordecai waxed greater and greater." "The fear of the Jews fell upon all people." "Many of the people of the land became Jews." The writer may have made use of Persian documents, as some suppose to be intimated in ix. 20, 32. If so, he could not have literally extracted and translated. It is wholly groundless to assert that by speaking of the God of Israel the compiler would have deprived it of an internal character of truth; for was it not true that God interposed to save his people? A Jewish complexion it has at present; how then could the presence of the divine name make it less worthy of credit? On the whole, we believe there is no book in the Old Testament so far removed from the tenor of the gospel as that of Esther. The narrow, national spirit of the Jews appears throughout it in a most unamiable point of view. Revenge and persecution characterise the chosen people. The writer manifestly approves of the conduct of Mordecai, Esther, and their brethren. He speaks of them in such a way as shews his own views to be accordant with theirs. In his view they thought and acted worthily of their nation. The fictitious embellishment of the story proves this; since there is no doubt that it proceeded in part from the writer himself. Not a word is said of the sins and provocations of the Jews, as a faithful historian would have done. They are right, and their enemies deserve to be massacred because Haman intended to kill them.

Whoever the author was, he knew how to compose a history with skill and freedom. Possessing considerable power of description, he could produce a pleasing narrative. Yet he wanted the living energy of the old, genuine Hebrews, who grasped the

higher truths of their religion, and made them shine through the materials of history. The picture drawn of the time and circumstances in which the Purim festival originated is faithfully maintained to the end; the unknown author shewing himself a master in uniform consistency of delineation. But the spirit of the old religion had almost departed in his day; and he could not take a higher stand-point. His entire method of treating and elaborating history is unlike the old Hebrew one. On account of the Purim festival the work has been thought worthy of a place in the canon; though it is certainly alien from the object and end of genuine Hebrew pragmatism. All the characteristics of good writing are present, except the animating soul of Hebraism giving forth its purer truths. The forms moving before us are new, beyond the living circle of the old religion, as though the author wished to avoid mentioning things that constituted the best elements of Hebrew thought and feeling. His narrative as a piece of writing is vivid, circumstantial in details, skilfully constructed, in the gradual and progressive development of results complete; but it makes a passionate revenge triumphant, rather than the old faith of patriarchs and prophets which rested directly upon the active interference of God on behalf of His covenant-people. The enemies of Mordecai and the Jews are simply *their* enemies, not the enemies of *Jehovah*. God does not give them over into the hands of the Jews: human power does so. Thus the whole conception of history is different from what we see in the earlier historical books.

We cannot agree with Herzfeld in accounting for the absence of all acknowledgment of God on the ground of the writer representing the work as far as ix. 19 to have been written by Mordecai and omitting everything Jewish through its supposed adaptation to the position and circumstances in which the alleged author stood. It has greatly surprised us to find an esteemed writer uttering such ideas as these: "The presence of God is to us everywhere *felt* and indicated in the book, and it is therefore of little real consequence that the name of God does not occur. The tendency of the book is indeed so pious, that we read it many times in our youth without noticing the absence of the divine name; and should perhaps not have found it out to this day, had it not been indicated by others."¹ We leave the conscience and heart of every reader to contradict this extraordinary statement. *Piety*, in our view, leads the soul to God; and *expresses* itself in acts of grateful devotion to him. Here, however, *the absence*

¹ Kitto, notes to the Pictorial Bible.

of the divine name and of any distinct reference to His overruling providence, is converted into an evidence of its existence!

After the preceding discussion it is needless to mention the various conjectures which have been hazarded respecting the author. Mordecai, to whom many attribute the composition from the leading part he took in the transaction and the desire he evinced to perpetuate its remembrance, cannot have been the writer, else he would not speak of himself, his greatness and his fame, in the manner of the third and fourth verses of the ninth chapter. Nor would he so generally characterise himself as "the Jew." The verses ix. 20, 23, 26, are no proof that Mordecai was the author of the book, since they refer merely to letters and documents. Ezra was not the writer; as seems to have been commonly believed in the time of Augustine and Isidore. Neither was it composed by Jehoiakim the high priest, son of Jeshua; as Rabbi Azarias and Pseudo-Philo in his *Chronographia* supposed: nor by the men of the great synagogue, as stated in the Talmud.

VIII. ESTIMATES OF THE BOOK BY JEWS AND CHRISTIANS.—The Jews hold the book in very high estimation, placing it in part on a level with the law of Moses, and exalting it above the other portions of the hagiographa, as well as above the prophets. This is the result of a later Rabbinism, not the earliest Jewish opinion. At first it does not seem to have obtained universal recognition, if we may judge from the Jerusalem Talmud, where we read that thirty out of eighty-five elders and some prophets objected to the introduction of the Purim festival by Esther and Mordecai as an innovation against the law.¹ Even if this be a fabrication, it would not have originated if all the Jews from the first had entertained the same sentiments respecting the authority of the work. Bertheau doubts whether the passage refers to the entire book of Esther, and inclines to think it relates merely to the prescription about fasting in ix. 29-32.² The passage refers merely to the festival, not to the book or any part of it. *By implication* only, can doubt about the book of Esther be derived from it. But Herzfeld shews that the notice in question has been erroneously put together out of Nehemiah viii.-x. and Esther ix. 29; the number out of the former, and their refusal at first to introduce the festival out of the latter.³ According to Megilla 7a., it was debated whether the book "makes the hands unclean," so that the same dispute which had been carried on for several generations respecting Ecclesiastes, was extended to Esther also. In the lists of the

¹ Tr. Megilloth, fols. 1, 5.

² Eregot. Handbuch, xvii. page 283.

³ Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. ii. p. 358

canonical books of the Old Testament given by early Christian authors, Esther is omitted by Melito and Gregory of Nazianzum. It is easy to say with Stuart, that Eusebius in copying the document of Melito, accidentally omitted Esther, and that Gregory copied from Eusebius;¹ but this is mere conjecture. Athanasius separated the book from the canonical ones and put it among the second class, the ἀναγινωσκόμενα; thus treating it like the apocryphal writings. In the *Iambi ad Sellucam* and the *Synopsis Sacrae Scripturae* it is said that the book is ranked by some among the canonical ones. So late as the sixth century we learn from Junilius that it was much doubted whether it belongs to the canon. Thus in successive ages after its appearance there were doubts regarding Esther, shewing that a difficulty was felt in reconciling its tone and spirit with those of the gospel. The fact of its not being quoted by Philo or the New Testament argues nothing against its canonicity, because it equally applies to other books of the Old Testament, such as Nehemiah. It is hardly necessary to say, that Esther formed a part of the Jewish canon from the first; for it was translated into Greek by the LXX. Perhaps the apocryphal additions appended to the work pretty early were the cause of some doubts respecting its authority. This is most probable in the case of the Christian fathers, who, not knowing Hebrew, were obliged to use the Septuagint exclusively. But the remark does not apply to all. The want of the name of God was a great stumbling-block, as well it might; for where is the truly pious Jew who would write ten chapters about his countrymen being wonderfully delivered from a fearful destruction and instituting an annual feast in commemoration of so remarkable an event, without speaking of Jehovah's great goodness and mercy to them in the matter? With that instinctive sense of the true and worthy which distinguished the great Reformer, Luther writes, "Though the Hebrews have this last (Esther) in their canon, it is in my judgment more worthy than all of being excluded from it."² "When the doctor," as we are told in his Table-talk, "was correcting the translation of the second book of the Maccabees, he said, I dislike this book and that of Esther so much, that I wish they did not exist; for they Judaize too much, and have much heathenish extravagance. Then master Forster said, The Jews esteem the book of Esther more than any of the prophets."³ Archdeacon Hare is mistaken in thinking that Luther here spoke of the book of *Esdras*; because Forster's remark could not possibly apply to it, while it is right

¹ Critical history and defence of the O. T. canon, p. 242, ed. Davidson.

² De servo arbitrio.

³ Tischreden, in his Works edited by Walch, vol. xxii. p. 2080.

in relation to Esther.¹ Luther did not translate the *first* book of Esdras (LXX.). In like manner Pellican and Semler stumbled at the spirit of the book.²

The Catholic theologian Sixtus Senensis in his *Bibliotheca Sancta*, put it on a footing with the deuterocanonical books. These writers shew a true appreciation of the tone pervading it. Luther's slender regard for the work approves itself to every unprejudiced mind. The religious spirit and tendency constitute a criterion of authority that cannot be condemned. While the Persian monarch is named 187 times and his kingdom twenty-six, the name of the great Jehovah is passed over. Surely Judaism had degenerated when it could tolerate so strange an oversight. It had become an earthly thing, like the earthly empires with which it came in contact, and under whose shadow its soul departed.

¹ Vindication of Luther against his recent English assailants, pp. 220, 221, second edition.

² See Pellican on Esther viii. 16; and Semler's *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canon*, Zweiter Theil, pp. 150, 151.

THE POETICAL BOOKS.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

I. NAME OF THE HERO DESCRIBED IN THE BOOK.—The name **יֹב** is derived from the verb **יָבַח** which occurs in Ex. xxiii. 22, and signifies *to be an adversary*. In this case **יֹב** has a passive sense, *the persecuted one*, the man afflicted by calamities. Ewald derives the word from **יָבַח** *to return, to repent*, with reference to the fact that Job returned submissively to God after long murmuring against him. This latter is favoured by the fact that in the Koran (Surat xxxviii. ver. 40-44) Job is termed **يَا جِب** *he that turns or repents*. But in the same Surat (ver. 29) the same name is applied to David. We prefer the former derivation, both because repentance was hardly characteristic of Job, and also because it is unnecessary to go to the Arabic when Hebrew suffices.

II. CONTENTS.—The book of Job derives its name from the prominent person in it, whose worldly prosperity, severe afflictions, and exemplary patience, succeeded by restoration to more than original affluence, are set forth with great power and skill. The contents are briefly the following.

In the land of Uz lived the pious Job. He was the richest emir of the east. On a certain day the angels came to present themselves before Jehovah, and Satan among them, who, being asked respecting Job, replied that his piety was not of a kind to withstand a reverse of fortune. Jehovah gave Satan permission to tempt him on condition that his person should be untouched. In pursuance of this, all his property and children were suddenly destroyed. A similar scene took place again, when Satan got permission to make the experiment on Job's own person, with the limitation to spare his life. The adversary therefore smote him with a loathsome disease over his whole person. But in the midst of so great calamities, domestic and personal, the sufferer retained his integrity; not sinning with

his lips but patiently submitting to the dispensation of the Almighty. Three friends hearing of his misfortunes came to mourn with and comfort him. In the first instance, however, they sat beside him in perfect silence seven days and nights, none uttering a word. Such is the historical introduction or prologue, written in prose and embracing the first two chapters.

Three series of controversy or dialogue follow. The first is ushered in by Job's cursing the day on which he was born. Suspecting the cause of his friends' silence to lie in their view of the origin of his condition, he gives impatient vent to his wounded feelings in rash and vehement complaints. This leads at once to discussion. The friends can refrain no longer from expressing their opinion of the cause of his misfortunes. Eliphaz is the first speaker. He reproves the sufferer's impatience, calls his integrity in question by insinuating that God does not inflict such punishment on the uniformly righteous but on the sinful only. In conclusion, he advises him, instead of striving with the Almighty, to seek a renewal of the divine favour by repenting of the sins which must have provoked such retribution (iii.-v.).

In reply to Eliphaz, Job apologises for the passionate warmth of his complaints by the greatness of his sufferings, complains of the harsh treatment of his friends, and expostulates with God respecting his unmerited misfortunes (vi., vii.).

Bildad resumes the argument of Eliphaz, and enforces it with greater acrimony. He tells Job that the death of his children had been owing to their transgressions; and that if he would be restored to his former prosperous state, he should reform not murmur. God would not cast away an upright man (viii.).

In reply, Job admits that every man must be wanting when judged by the standard of God's perfect purity; and that it were vain to contend with Him, because of His resistless power. If he were ever so innocent, he would not maintain his innocence, but supplicate his judge for favour. He then returns to the language of complaint, and in despair wishes for death (ix., x.).

Zophar, the third, follows, reproving with more severity than his companions. He says that a babbler ought to be answered, and a mocker put to shame. As for Job's claim to purity, if God would only speak, its baselessness would be seen. Less retribution, it would appear, had been exacted than was deserved. In his infinite wisdom the Almighty could discover transgressions unknown even to the doer. In conclusion, the speaker exhorts Job to repentance as the only means of recovering former prosperity (xi.).

The reply of the sufferer contains a censure of the speakers

for their pretensions to superior wisdom. He asserts again that there is no discrimination in the arrangements of providence with regard to character in man; acknowledges the general doctrine of God's unlimited sovereignty, declaring that he knew it as well as they; denies that they are right in counting his sufferings a retribution for sins; charges them with hypocrisy and uncharitableness; appeals to God in attestation of his innocence; prays that some respite may be granted him before the close of his appointed pilgrimage; and wishes for the time when he could be hid in the grave (xii.-xiv.).

The first series of controversy contains three speeches of the three friends, with Job's reply to each.

The second series of controversy begins with another speech from Eliphaz, more vehement than the first, but still in the same strain. He condemns the confidence with which Job had asserted his innocence; proves from past experience that providence never allows the wicked to escape punishment; and that therefore Job's afflictions must be looked upon as symptomatic of wickedness (xv.).

Job, in reply, says he has heard enough from pretended friends, who had only aggravated his distress. He then resumes the strain of complaint; professes his unconsciousness of any wickedness that could have brought him to such a state; desires that his friends should argue no longer or remain longer with him; and looks for death as his last refuge (xvi., xvii.).

Bildad's second speech is like his first, inculcating the general idea that Job's sufferings are tokens of God's displeasure with his wickedness. It contains no exhortation as before, that Job should confess and forsake his sins that he may obtain forgiveness (xviii.).

The sufferer in reply complains bitterly of the cruelty of his friends and the hard treatment of God; craves pity; wishes that his words so culpable in their eyes were written down, for then they would be fairly considered; and professes his hope that God would hereafter appear to vindicate the justice of his cause against his accusers—the hope of immortality beyond Hades (xix.).

The second speech of Zophar enlarges on the sure downfall and portion of the wicked (xx.).

The reply of Job dwells on the fact that the wicked are often favoured in this world. They frequently spend their days in prosperity, and end them in peace. In direct opposition to Zophar, he describes the wicked as especially prosperous in the world (xxi.).

The third series of controversy or debate is opened as before by Eliphaz, who asserts more directly that Job's misfortunes are

the result of his crimes; charges him with specific sins; and affirms it vain to suppose they have escaped God's notice. He concludes with renewed exhortation to repentance and prayer (xxii.).

In reply, Job complains of the hardship of having no opportunity for self-vindication. If he could find God, he is confident that he should be able to establish his righteousness and be acquitted. But this he cannot do; for the Almighty appears inflexible in his purposes of anger towards him. On the contrary, the wicked for the same cause escape punishment in this life and are prosperous (xxiii., xxiv.).

The rejoinder of Bildad briefly expresses the majesty and holiness of God, before whom man cannot be pure (xxv.).

Job commences his last discourse with an allusion to the very small contribution furnished by Bildad towards an elucidation of the topic discussed; after which he acknowledges God's power and greatness, and proceeds to admit that there is truth in what the friends have advanced concerning the danger of a wicked life, though he himself is not guilty. The blessings enjoyed by the hypocrite and sinner are frequently turned into curses. He then contrasts his present and former state, adverting to himself in the relative situations of life as a husband, master, magistrate; strongly protests his integrity, and concludes with an ardent wish for immediate trial before the Almighty's tribunal (xxvi.-xxxi.).

The discussion ceases. The three disputants appear to be silenced by Job's concluding discourse. Another speaker presents himself. Elihu says that, being only a young man, he had hitherto refrained from expressing his opinion, but that he was now resolved to declare it; that none of the speakers had confuted Job, but that the latter had rather silenced them. He finds fault with the sufferer for asserting his innocence as he had done, and so accusing God of injustice. And then he declares the common method of the divine procedure, in which men are often afflicted for gracious purposes, and maintains that Job is blameworthy for adopting the irreverent language of evil doers. In all cases the divine chastisements should be received with submission. A fine description of several divine attributes concludes the discourse (xxxii.-xxxvii.).

After Elihu has spoken, Jehovah himself interposes and speaks. In a long address, expressed for the most part in the interrogative form, he shews Job the folly of questioning the justice or wisdom of the divine government, when he is unable to control, or even comprehend, the commonest phenomena of nature. The speech of Jehovah out of the whirlwind is most sublime (xxxviii.-xli.).

This appeal to Job is followed by an expression of meek submission and repentance on the part of the sufferer (xlii. 1-6).

Jehovah then expresses displeasure with Eliphaz and the other two friends for speaking wrongly of Him. Job's prayer for his friends is accepted; he is restored to affluence; his flocks and herds are doubled; he receives as many sons and daughters as before; and dies in a good old age (xlii. 7-17).

Such is the epilogue, written in prose like the prologue. The dialogue or controversy containing the argument, is in poetry, viz., iii.-xlii. 6.

III. STRUCTURE OF THE POEM.—Some have called it an epic poem; as Stuss, Lichtenstein, Ilgen, and Good. The last named critic supposes that it has all the prominent features of an epic as described by Aristotle himself, such as unity, completeness, grandeur in action, loftiness of sentiment and language, multitude and variety in the passions it develops. The characters, too, are well discriminated and supported.¹ There is no propriety in calling it an epic. The prologue is opposed to that view. The narrative begins with the historical commencement, instead of following the rule given by Horace,

“Semper ad eventum festinat, et in medias res
Non secus ac notas, auditorem rapit.”

We do not deny that it has *something* of the epic character and form. Neither is it extravagant to call its form, with Keil, *lyric*; for the lyric is included in the dramatic.

The dramatic character of the poem can scarcely fail to escape the notice of the most careless reader. It is indeed a regular drama. A prologue in prose stands at the commencement of it, making the reader acquainted with the situation of the hero who is the subject. This is followed by the action itself beginning with a monologue of the hero, which is succeeded by the controversy with his friends contained as it were in three acts or series of the dialogue. Each act again consists of three attacks by the opponents, and as many defences. The conclusion of the action is formed by a monologue of the hero. Finally, God himself appears as judge of the combat, and pronounces his decision; after which an epilogue in prose gives the issue or catastrophe. Such is the *external* arrangement.

The *internal* or dialectic development corresponds to the outward structure. It does not lie in the arguments or ideas, however, so much as in the feelings. The former often remain at the same point, without any visible advance or return to their former position. In the latter there is manifest progress. Thus

¹ Good's introductory dissertation to his version of Job, sect. 2.

the development is not logical but dramatic. The different acts exemplify this statement. The speakers become more animated and impassioned. Their feelings wax hotter in each speech. All is hastening to one point. The opposition of views reaches its highest development in Job's reply to Eliphaz. There is a falling back in the short speech of Bildad, and a calmer tone in Job's subsequent assurance of integrity and honesty, terminating in a formal appeal to the decision of God.

According to this description it may be called a *tragedy*, as Mercer and Beza termed it long ago. It is true that it wants some of the features belonging to Greek tragedy. But the essence of it is tragical, because the dialogues are concerned with sufferings, which are viewed in connexion with a presumed moral cause—with secret guilt. We have seen too that passions come into play. A mystery is to be solved. There is both action and development—action consisting in dramatic development. We see man struggling with misfortune, and the passions arising out of it both in himself and others—man subjected in this way to a process of purification, whence he emerges humbler and better.

The peculiarities of this tragedy arise in part from the Hebrew soil it springs from. Thus it exhibits a doctrine of providence belonging to Hebrew theism. The *didactic* object of it is prominent; so that it may be called a didactic poem, for which the dramatic form is merely a vehicle. There is no plot or outward action. The hero falls into perplexity neither by his own guilt nor that of those connected with him, but by a disaster inflicted without his deserving it.

Thus the work is the divine drama of the ancient Hebrews. The dialogues have a rhythmical conformation; the parties who are introduced speaking have a character faithfully preserved; strict history is not followed; the parts are regularly distributed; an air of completeness marks the whole, and fiction lends its effect. It is unique, original, peculiar, distinguished not only by the elevation of its subject but the manner in which the poet has invested it with flesh and blood; arranging the parts with considerable art, and setting them together to make a finished picture. It is the sublimest composition of Hebrew genius inspired by God.

Tried by the Greek drama it cannot be called a *perfect* tragedy. It contains no plot or outward action, and exhibits one uniform succession of things without change of feature. But the Hebrew writers were not concerned with artificial rules of composition which were not invented till long after their death. Totally different in their intellectual developments, the Greeks and they followed different models.

The dialogues of the speakers, as several critics have observed, may be divided into strophes. They are so arranged by Koester,¹ whom Schlottmann usually follows. In like manner Ewald has tried to bring out a strophic structure.² This rythmical division is a noticeable thing. It appears in the Psalms also. It is not, however, very regularly or uniformly carried out by the writer, as far as we can perceive; though it may really exist and fail to be seen. As the poet has employed elaboration in the disposition of his theme, laying it out with masterly skill and shaping it with plastic hand, so that poetic art is combined with lofty conception, the existence of such strophes may be naturally looked for. Hebrew poetry presents them in other instances. Why not here? The danger is, that arbitrariness should become too prominent in their evolution; especially when critics allow free scope to subjectivity.

IV. LOCALITY OF JOB AND HIS THREE FRIENDS.—The theatre of Job's trials was the land of Uz. If this locality be regarded as the real dwelling place of the patriarch, not an imaginary creation of the poet, where should we look for it? It is elsewhere mentioned in Jer. xxv. 20; Lam. iv. 21. According to the Septuagint, where it is rendered *'Αυσίτης*, it lay on the borders of Idumea and Arabia, in the north-eastern part of Arabia Deserta. With this agrees a notice of Ptolemy (v. 19), who mentions a tribe called Aisitae (*Αισίται*, ? *'Αυσίται*) in the northern part of Arabia Deserta near Babylon and the Euphrates. Ewald thinks that the appellations Esau and Uz were originally the same.³ It was thus between Idumea, Palestine, and the Euphrates. Jahn identifies it with the valley of Damascus; but this could not have been so extensive as to justify the phrase "all the kings of the land of Uz" (Jer. xxv. 20).⁴ Fries again has supposed it to be the territory el-Tellul, which is bounded on the west by the mountainous tract Hauran, and on the south and east by the great wilderness el-Hammad, stretching northward as far as the 33rd parallel;⁵ which is too far north to agree well with the passages in Jeremiah and Lamentations. The inhabitants were an Aramaean tribe, which was subsequently amalgamated with the Nahorites and Horites. They were not therefore Idumaeans, though in close intercourse with them (Gen. x. 23, xxii. 21). Here they were exposed to the predatory incursions of the Sabaeans (Job i. 15), i.e., the Yemenites, a people to whom Genesis attributes both a Cushite and Shemite origin, as well as of the Chaldeans (Job i. 17).

¹ Das Buch Hiob strophisch uebersetzt, u. s. w. 1832.

² Das Buch Ijob uebersetzt und erklärt, zweite Auflage, 1854.

³ Das Buch Ijob, pp. 20, 21.

⁴ Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 768.

⁵ Studien und Kritiken for 1854, p. 299, et seqq.

They were acquainted with the caravans of Teman, a town of Idumea about five miles from Petra, and of Sheba (vi. 19)—caravans which must have travelled near the Uzzites, as they went with their merchandise along the Palestinian highway to the coast of the Mediterranean.

The names and native places of the three friends introduced into the work agree with this interpretation of Uz. Eliphaz was of Teman, *i.e.*, he was an Edomite; for Teman was the capital of Edom, and is sometimes used as the synonyme of it. Bildad was a Shuhite. Shuah, Abraham's son, gave his name to an Arabian tribe. The country of the Shuhites is supposed to have been the same with *Σακκαία* of Ptolemy (v. 15) in Arabia Deserta and east of Batanea. Zophar is termed a Naamathite. This patronymic is difficult, because, though Naamah, a city in the tribe of Judah is mentioned in Josh. xv. 41, it appears too distant from Uz. Yet there is no absolute necessity to have recourse to some unknown place of the same name. Naamah was near the south-eastern boundary of the tribe.

V. AGE OF JOB.—At what time Job lived in this territory it is not easy to discover. Yet attempts have been made to determine it very exactly. At the end of the Septuagint version is an appendix, which is said to have been taken from the old Syriac version, stating that Job's former name was Jobab, that he was the son of Karas, fifth in descent from Abraham, and reigned over Edom after Balak son of Beor. The old Latin and Arabic versions have the same addition, taken without doubt from the LXX. This register was looked upon with suspicion by several of the Greek and Latin fathers, and by Fred. Spanheim. It is undoubtedly of Christian origin, chiefly resting on the arbitrary combination of the names *Job* and *Jobab*, which are very similar in Greek. Kennicott gives a genealogical table in which Job is made contemporary with Amram, father of Moses.¹ Hales adduces a proof drawn from astronomy, by which Job's trial belongs to the year 2337 B.C. (2130 of the common chronology), or 818 years after the deluge, 184 years before the birth of Abraham, 474 years before Jacob's family settled in Egypt, and 689 years before their exodus.² Others, as Carpzov, Lightfoot, Chrysostom, etc., place Job between the last years of Joseph and the exodus, *i.e.*, between Ex. i. and ii. He has also been assigned to the ages of Moses, Jacob, Isaac, Joseph, Solomon, the time of the Judges, of Ahasuerus, of Nebuchadnezzar, of Ezra. It is impossible to determine his age with precision. It is most probable that he belonged to the patriarchal period, because—

¹ Remarks on select passages of Scripture, p. 152.

² Analysis of Sacred Chronology, vol. ii p. 53, et seqq., second edition.

1. The length of his life agrees best with this. He survived his trial 140 years (xlii. 16), so that he must have lived 200 years.

2. The only kind of money mentioned קֶשֶׁתָּה *kesitah*, belongs to the patriarchal period (Gen. xxxiii. 19; Josh. xxiv. 32). The word does not signify *a lamb*, as Magee supposes,¹ and does not shew therefore that his riches were reckoned solely by his cattle. Sales for money were common in the age of the patriarchs.

3. The only musical instruments mentioned are three of the oldest which appear in Genesis, viz., the flute or pipe עֹנֶב (a wind instrument); the lyre or cithara (a stringed instrument), כְּנֹר; and תֶּבֶל the drum or tabret (an instrument struck). Comp. Job xxx. 31, xxi. 12, with Gen. iv. 21, xxxi. 27.

4. Job speaks of the most ancient kind of writing by *sculpture* (xix. 23). The use of writing in judicial documents is also implied (xxx. 35).

5. According to the patriarchal usage, Job acted as high priest in his family (Gen. viii. 20).

6. Allusion is made by Job to that kind of idolatry which was the most ancient, viz., the worship of the sun and moon, or Zabianism. This agrees with the patriarchal age.

7. The number *seven* was a sacred number in the earliest

Hence Job's sacrifice consisted of *seven* oxen and *seven* rams.

These and other internal characteristics agree best with patriarchal times, and may therefore be taken as favourable to Job's living at that age. They may indeed be fictitious; but the evidence is equally valid, if the writer introduces nothing out of place or character in connection with his hero. In putting Job in patriarchal times, the author probably followed a true tradition. And in building up his poem on it, he has preserved a wonderful verisimilitude. Very rarely is he guilty of inadvertence in his description. As Job was an Aramaean, not an Israelite, the history recorded is one that does not belong to the promised race. It stands in no immediate connection with that of Israel. The hero is surrounded by shepherds not by priests; and therefore he himself offers sacrifices. The law given from Sinai is unmentioned. The ecclesiastical life and history of Israel are alike unnoticed. The writer assumes a position for his hero out of Palestine; and abides by it with remarkable fidelity, consistency, and freshness.

VI. HIS HISTORICAL EXISTENCE.—We have assumed the actual existence of such a person as Job. Yet some eminent critics

¹ Discourses on the atonement, vol. ii. pp. 59-61.

have called it in question, supposing that the whole poem is a fictitious narration intended to convey a moral lesson. The first trace of this opinion is in the Talmudist R. Resh Lakish.¹ The same view was held by Moses Maimonides, as well as by Junilius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Salmasius, Le Clerc, J. D. Michaelis, Dathe, Augusti, Bernstein, Bishop Stock, Semler, Hengstenberg, and others. The spirit of antiquity is adverse to this. In early times historical persons and the circumstances belonging to them were not created by the imagination. Fiction of this nature was a slow and gradual process, which was developed in the course of centuries. It was not a part of ancient but of modern literature; the genius of antiquity being averse, if not inadequate to, its evolution. We cannot see the validity of the argument urged against the reality of Job's existence derived from the nature of the exordium in which Satan appears as the accuser of Job. The conversation related to have taken place between the Almighty and Satan is certainly incredible if taken as literal history; but though it be the fiction of poetry it harmonises with Job's real personality. In like manner, the temptations and sufferings allowed by the Almighty to befall an upright character do not really militate against the view of Job's existence, unless every particular recorded be taken as literal history, contrary to reason and Scripture. The artificial regularity of the numbers descriptive of the patriarch's possessions do not tell against the same hypothesis, unless they contain a real and true history of things as they occurred. The choice does not lie between the actual existence of the patriarch involving a literal history of his temptations and sufferings, and the wholly fictitious character of the hero with all that is related in the poem bearing his name. These are *two extremes*, to neither of which are we bound to resort. Both are objectionable. It is favourable to the hypothesis of Job's real personality that Ezekiel speaks of him along with Noah and Daniel: "Though these three men Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness, saith the Lord God" (xiv. 14). Here real characters seem to be associated. So also James writes in his general epistle: "Ye have heard of the patience of Job and have seen the end of the Lord, that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy" (v. 11). That an imaginary person should be cited as an example of patience is improbable. Yet fictitious and real characters may be put together, as Lazarus and Abraham. The narrative in Luke (xvi.) does not profess to be fictitious: it has been doubted by some if it be a parable at all. Hence there cannot be so

¹ Baba bathra, fol. 15, 1. See Magnus's Comment, z. B. Hiob, p. 298.

much difference between the two cases. The concurrent testimony of eastern tradition, though often quoted for the real existence of Job is irrelevant, because it appears to have been drawn from the book itself. Were it independent of the work it would be in point, not otherwise. Accordingly it proves nothing that Job is mentioned by the writer of Tobit's apocryphal book; or by Mohammed; or that the Chaldeans and Assyrians knew his history; or that many noble families among the Arabians were distinguished by his name and boasted of his ancestry. Traditionary accounts of the place of his abode are late. That many persons in Arabia went to see his dunghill, even in the fourth century, shews their foolish credulity. His grave indeed is shewn at six different places in the East, which may afford some proof of his historical existence. But while his reality cannot be denied by the sober critic, it does not follow that the book bearing his name contains a literal history. It is a poem, and why convert poetry into prose? Is it not absurd to make *history* out of a dramatic poem? In the time of the author, an ancient tradition existed respecting a remarkably upright and patient man called Job, who had been exposed to remarkable vicissitudes. The few facts embodied in this traditional story were taken as the ground-work of a poem, and disposed, enlarged, moulded, according to the object in view. The basis alone is historical—all the rest pure fiction. It is now impossible to separate the facts respecting Job from the legendary and fictitious. Even in the author's day both may have been inseparably blended together. In addition to the name of the hero, the land of his abode, the disease with which he was afflicted, the names and localities of his three friends with their visits to him, were probably historical. Rare trials befel him suddenly and unexpectedly, in his family and possessions. Beyond these particulars we dare not go. The rest is the embellishment with which genius has invested this remarkable man. Nothing is more obvious than the regular structure and artificial arrangement of the whole. Everything is disposed in such a way as to contribute to one end. How could Job, tormented with a loathsome disease and wretched in mind, utter long speeches highly poetical, elaborate, and polished in diction? Could his friends too have spoken as they are represented, in a poetical style, and with a peculiar adaptation to the main theme that excites the admiration of all eyes? Would they have uttered finished speeches, compact, progressive in argument, in highly-wrought language? Were they all rare poets—poets too who could pour forth at once such sentiments, in a style evincing careful elaboration? And can it be thought by any rational mind, that Jehovah spake audibly out of the midst

of a whirlwind? Is the conversation between the Almighty and Satan to be taken as literal history? If so, the latter is supposed to return with intelligence from the terrestrial regions. And is it consistent with other representations of Satan to suppose that he presented himself before God in an assembly of good spirits to promote mischief among men? The prologue, if any part, bears on its face the stamp of fiction. But the artificiality of plan and numbers is the strongest proof of the poetical nature of the contents. Thus the number *three* occurs regularly throughout. The entire matter is distributed into three parts, prologue, discourses, and epilogue. The prologue and epilogue contain each of them three particulars; and the dialogues exhibit three series of controversy. Even in the speeches of Jehovah and Elihu, three parts may be discerned. The discourses of the three friends gradually shew the insufficiency of the proof offered on behalf of the current doctrine of divine retribution, by their becoming each time jejuner and shorter; so that the second merely repeats a general proposition in the third debate; while the third speaker has nothing more to advance. Job had seven sons and three daughters, 7,000 sheep, 3,000 camels, a thousand oxen, and exactly half the number of asses. At his restoration to health and prosperity his property is exactly doubled. He receives as many children as he had lost. One misfortune comes upon him suddenly and rapidly after another; each succeeding one severer than the last, till all his children perish. And from each disaster a solitary individual escapes to bring the terrible tidings. These phenomena clearly shew that the book is a poem, in which genius and reflection have idealised and embellished a few traditional materials. The historical circumstances are very few; certainly not all related in the prose, any more than in the poetical part. The author had a philosophical problem to discuss in a poetical form. In the course of his lofty argument he puts appropriate sentiments into the mouths of the speakers, who maintain the current doctrine of retribution. The hero of the story is made to utter the philosophic doubts of the author himself, whose mind had evidently struggled to free itself from the generally received view of divine retribution. With bold spirit he combats the Judaism of his time which held the invariable connection between virtue and prosperity. Emotions powerfully affecting the mind of the gifted writer where faith and reason struggle against one another gave rise to the poem, for which he found a suitable basis in tradition. We must not therefore make the form of the work anything but the offspring of poetical license; or the adorning of it other than fancy's creation. An ancient tradition suitably moulded takes the form of a grand poem, in

which the writer's doubts and difficulties respecting the ways of God to man are vividly presented. A great deal has been made of the two passages in Ezekiel and James, for the purpose of shewing that most of the particulars stated respecting Job are historical facts. But the reasoning is nugatory. The Job delineated in the embellishments of the writer is as likely to be the man whom the two writers would place before their readers, as the Job eliminated from the poem by converting it into literal history. A man of whom little certain is known, except that he had great patience amid unusual sufferings, is as worthy to be selected for an example as though all ascribed to him were literal fact.

VII. LOCALITY AND AGE OF THE WRITER.—The author was not a foreigner. He was not an Idumæan as Eichhorn, Herder, and Ilgen supposed, for reasons justly exploded at the present day. He was not a Nahorite, as Niemeyer conjectured. In that case he may have been an Idumæan. The work is not a translation from the Syriac; which is only asserted in an old commentary falsely ascribed to Origen, where it is said that Moses translated it out of the Syriac (Aramæan) into Hebrew; and apparently in the appendix to the Greek version. The words however of *that addition* rather say, that he took the appendix from the Syriac, οὗτος ἐρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου, ἐν μὲν γῇ κατοικῶν, κ. τ. λ. And even if it *did* attest the Syriac original of the book, no weight could be attached to it, because little can be said for an Aramæan original. Neither is it a translation from the Arabic, as Kromeyer, Spanheim, Witsius, and Vitranga, thought. The author must have been an Israelite; for his Hebrew culture shines forth from his bold philosophy. While the scene of the hero is in Arabia, out of Palestine, the author's own stand-point is Israelitish. Thus in the narrative part he calls the Deity *Jehorah*, involuntarily betraying the God and country of his fathers. But the appellation is only twice put into the mouth of Job (i. 21, xii. 9); being usually avoided in the body of the work. Job and his friends commonly apply אֱלֹהִים to the Deity (forty-one times), which is a more poetical expression and one more suitable to speakers who are not Israelites than the plural אֱלֹהִים, which occurs only three times (xx. 29; xxxii. 2; xxxviii. 7). They also apply אֱלֹהִים, which is often in Genesis, in the patriarchal time. If then the writer was a native Jew, where did he live? Was he in Palestine when he composed the work; in Jerusalem the centre of the theocracy; or in the mountainous region of the South not far from Egypt, Edom, and Arabia? Was he in Egypt when it was written? These

are difficult questions to answer. Hitzig¹ and Hirzel² suppose that he lived in Egypt, because an intimate acquaintance with the productions and objects of that country appears in the work. Accordingly Hirzel appeals to the description of mine-working in xxviii. 1-11, and of the Nile-horse and crocodile, xl. 15-xli. 26. It is also said that the author is well acquainted with the Nile, and therefore borrows figures from it, ix. 26; viii. 11, etc.; vii. 12. He had seen the mausolea of the Egyptian kings, iii. 14, etc.; and is familiar with the myth respecting the phoenix, xxix. 18. In like manner, the process of law customary among the Egyptians is referred to, xxxi. 35: and the description of the war-horse (xxxix. 19-25) reminds the reader of the fame of Egypt above other lands for its cavalry. Ewald assigns only xl. 15-xli. 26 to Egypt. Most of these considerations appear to us insufficient proof of that for which they are adduced. If there was much intercourse between Palestine and Egypt they lose their force. To the Hebrews the latter land was one of special interest, ever since their fathers had sojourned in it. The knowledge of mining implied (xxviii. 1-11) can hardly refer to Egypt, because gold alone was procured there, not the other metals mentioned, silver, iron, brass. And the mines of Egypt were only in the extreme south, on the borders of Ethiopia. They were also worked in the most ancient times, but afterwards intermitted for a long period. The description suits Arabia. Boats made of the papyrus (ix. 26; viii. 11) appear in Isaiah (xviii. 2), so that nothing can be drawn from allusion to them; and vii. 12 is indefinite. It is by no means certain that iii. 14, 15 refer to mausolea in Egypt. They may point to the splendid sepulchres of the Hebrew kings and nobles, which were sometimes filled with treasures. The word מִקְבָּרִים, however, may as well mean *houses*, as abodes for the dead. The knowledge of the myth of the phoenix does not necessitate the author's abode in Egypt; since he might have become acquainted with it by intercourse with the inhabitants of that country travelling for commercial purposes. The interpretation of xxxi. 35 is too uncertain to allow of its allusion to the usages of judicial procedure among the Egyptians. Nor can the description of the war-horse (xxxix. 19-25) refer to Egypt in particular; because Solomon had a great many horses brought out of that country (1 Kings x. 28). But the hippopotamus and crocodile are so graphically presented to the eye of the reader in xl. 15-xli. 26, that they appear to be depicted from nature. It is likely that the writer saw them in Egypt. Even this does

¹ Der Prophet Iesaias uebersetzt und ausgelegt, p. 285.

² Hiob erklärt, Einleitung, p. 12.

not warrant the conclusion that he lived there. We may suppose that he travelled into that and other lands, where he saw their products and wonders. Having acquired extensive knowledge he composed the present work ; and transfers the river horse from the Nile to the Jordan as a Hebrew would naturally do : "though a Jordan reaches to his mouth," i.e., the greatest river to a Hebrew. Thus we do not consider it necessary to assign an Egyptian abode to the writer, to account for any of the allusions or descriptions in his work. All that is required is to conceive of a man of reading well acquainted with the traditions of his own nation—one who had come in contact with different peoples, their life, their habits ; and had travelled in Egypt. He possessed graphic power to describe what he had seen, as well as what he had read, or heard. Perhaps he lived in Southern Judea where he had opportunities of seeing caravans from Teman and Sabaea ; and where the mines of Arabia would not be strange. In that case he could more readily enter into the fortunes of his hero, and describe his relations with greater fidelity. This is slightly favoured by some dialectic peculiarities which agree with those in Amos the prophet of Tekoah, adduced by Stickel,¹ such as the interchange of **ד** and **ז** (Amos vi. 10 ; Job v. 2 ; vi. 2), and the union of **כִּסִּיל** with **כִּימָה** (Amos v. 8 ; Job ix. 9 ; xxxviii. 31). Wherever the author lived, we can scarcely conceive of him dwelling apart in the midst of his nation, a solitary recluse possessing extraordinary insight : his mind had been stimulated and enlarged by a knowledge of men and things acquired at a time when the Hebrews had considerable intercourse with Arabia. The name of the minstrel (which was not Baruch, as Bunsen thinks) is lost in the oblivion of antiquity. But his work lives and will last for ever, reflecting a light amid the darkness of the old economy, which illumines its dim shadows by shewing the boundary between knowledge and faith. Like a star of the first magnitude, his brilliant genius attracts the admiration of men as it points to the Almighty Ruler chastening yet loving his people. Of one whose sublime conceptions mounting the height where Jehovah is enthroned in light inaccessible to mortal eye lift him far above his time and people—who climbs the ladder of the Eternal as if to open heaven,—of this giant philosopher and poet we long to know something ; his habitation, name, appearance. The very spot where his ashes rest, though marked by no monument, we desire to gaze upon. But in vain. Probably his contemporaries were not alive to the unique excellence of his work, towering as it did above all the effusions

¹ Hiob, p. 263 et seqq.

of the Hebrew muse, and overleaping the slow growth of Hebrew ideas. The great poem itself is all we can have. And it is enough. In the emanation of this gifted spirit, shrouded as he now is in miraculous concealment—in the imperishable monument of his genius, he still speaks to men of the divine justice, omnipotence, wisdom, with a daringness merging into the modest humility befitting the creature man. "With his unuttered name," says Herder, "he has consigned to oblivion all that was earthly; and leaving his book for a memorial below, is engaged in a yet nobler song in that world where the voice of sorrow and mourning is unheard, and where the morning stars sing together."¹

The opinions entertained of the time when he lived have been very various:

1. Some suppose that he lived before Moses. Carpzov, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Ilgen, Stuhlmann, and others have been favourable to this view. Job himself is fixed upon as the author by Lee, Elihu by others; or at least some contemporary. In favour of this it is alleged,

(a) That the author of the book recognises no priestly caste; and Job himself offers sacrifices, according to the ancient patriarchal custom where each father of a family was priest. Here the author of the book is erroneously identified with the hero. To be consistent and suitable, the description must represent Job according to the age in which he is supposed to have lived. Although, therefore, the patriarch is said to have offered sacrifices, the writer was not ignorant of the existence of a priestly order.

(b) His opponents never charge Job with idolatry, though that would have first suggested itself to an Israelite living after the introduction of heathen rites. Here again the author is erroneously identified with the hero; and because the former is consistent in the character he draws of the patriarch, it is erroneously inferred that the book was written before the Israelites were settled in Canaan.

(c) God is represented under the patriarchal image in which the ancients regarded Him, rather than as invested with the royalty inherent in the Mosaic notion of the Deity. This statement is hardly correct, since the first chapter paints Jehovah as a monarch surrounded by obedient beings. And even if it were, the patriarchal image is in character with the scene and time.

(d) In this book we perceive that reverence for the aged which generally prevails under a patriarchal system, where wisdom is attached to grey hairs.

¹ Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, translated by Marsh, vol. i. pp. 120, 121.

There is no real evidence that the book was pre-Mosaic. All the characters of antiquity belonging to it—the total absence of allusion to the manners, customs, ceremonies, etc., of the Israelites—the *assumption* that Job tells his own story, or that Elihu relates it, are without foundation. If the book were pre-Mosaic or patriarchal in origin, the language ought to have an archaic and primitive stamp. The colouring and scenery are archaic; but the style is *not*. It is majestic, often rugged, yet of a nature to shew that writing had been long used; because the thoughts which are generally of a profound character, have moulded it so as to prevent the prevalence of fluency and flexibility. The language is singularly artificial and elaborate. The absence in it of all traces of the Mosaic prescriptions does not prove its early date any more than the like absence of them in Proverbs and the book of Judges shews their great antiquity. An appeal to the law would have violated the plan and unity of the book. The problem discussed is intentionally argued irrespectively of the law. Although, therefore, no mention be made of a positive law, the pre-existence of the Mosaic code is not excluded. Yet there are passages which appear at least to contain plain references even to the written law of Moses, as we shall see hereafter.

2. Others have attributed the authorship to Moses; as Saadiah, and various Talmudists and Rabbins, as Kimchi, Abenesra, Manasseh ben Israel; Ephrem Syrus, some Greek and Latin fathers; and in modern times, Michaelis, Hufnagel, Dr. Mason, Good, Palfrey, etc.

The chief argument adduced is the coincidence of many expressions in the work with those occurring in the Pentateuch, and Genesis in particular. They are drawn out in full array by Prof. Lee. The following are the chief ones in his list: Job iv. 17, *his Maker*; comp. Gen. i. 26, 31; ii. 1, 3, 4, 18. Job iv. 18, *his angels*; Gen. xvi. 7, 9, 10, etc.; xix. 1, etc.; xxi. 17; xxii. 11, 15; xxiv. 7, 40; xxxi. 11; xlviii. 16; Ex. iii. 2; xiv. 19, etc. Job v. 2, *For wrath killeth the foolish man, and envy slayeth the silly one*; Deut. xxix. 18, 20, "The heart turneth away from the Lord . . . the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man . . . and the Lord shall blot out his name from under heaven." Job v. 7, *Yet man is born unto trouble*; Gen. iii. 16, 17, 19, "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children . . . in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," etc. Job v. 8, *I would seek unto God, and unto God would I commit my cause*; comp. Deut. throughout. Job v. 9, *which doeth great things . . . marvellous things without number*; comp. Gen. xviii. 14, etc; Ex. xxxiv. 10; Josh. iii. 5; Judg. vi. 13. Job v. 18, *For he*

maketh sore and bindeth up; he woundeth and his hands make whole; comp. Deut. xxxii. 39, "I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal." Job v. 21, *Thou shalt be hid from the scourge of the tongue; neither shalt thou be afraid of destruction when it cometh*; comp. Deut. vii. 18, "Thou shalt not be afraid of them." Deut. xx. 1, "and seest horses and chariots and a people more than thou, be not afraid of them." Job v. 25, *Thou shalt know also that thy seed shall be great, and thine offspring as the grass of the earth*; comp. Gen. i. 11, "the herb yielding seed;" Gen. xv. 5, "so shall thy seed be;" Gen. xxii. 17, "in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven," etc. Job v. 26, *Thou shalt come to the grave in a full age, like as a shock of corn cometh in his season*; comp. Gen. xv. 15, "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age;" Gen. xxv. 8, "Abraham died in a good old age, an old man and full," etc.; Deut. xxx. 20, "For he is thy life and the length of thy days."¹

The catalogue of passages in Job resembling others in the Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, etc., is similar to this one relating to the Pentateuch. Few will suppose that they prove what they are adduced to shew, viz., that the work coming through the hands of Jethro to Moses (so Lee conjectures), and augmented by the latter with the addition of the first two chapters and the last, became the great pattern of composition to all future writers, and was imitated in the very terms and phraseology used.²

It is also stated that Moses had great abilities, which were carefully developed by his education at an Egyptian court, and therefore he was competent to compose a poem so artificial. His songs inserted in the Pentateuch attest his poetical talents. As he lived forty years in Egypt and forty in Arabia, he became well acquainted with both countries and their natural history, evidence of which appears in the book. Moses had wood, precious and common metals, and many kinds of stone made into different sorts of work. He also caused skins to be prepared, woven, and artificially coloured. He commanded that inscriptions should be cut in stone. He was familiar with armour, chariots of war, horsemanship, wars, encampments, ordinary field-camps and marches, war trumpets, etc., such as we find in Job.

He was well acquainted with the natural history of animals and with diseases. He describes the symptoms and marks of leprosy. All this agrees with Job.

The writer of the book makes his characters lay stress on the

¹ The book of the patriarch Job, Introduction, p. 71, et seqq.

² Ibid. pp. 70, 71.

doctrine of the ancient world; and Moses collects in Genesis the most important doctrines and instructive events of antiquity.

In Job the whole aim is to inculcate obedience to the commands of God, and morality. In the Pentateuch it is the same.

The author of the book says nothing of Palestine, nothing of the far-spread miracles which took place before, at and after the exodus from Egypt, nothing of the Mosaic law, etc. He also uses words not in the sense they received during the legislation. He is ignorant of a *shekel*, and knows nothing but the *Kesitah*. All this corresponds to the situation of the legislator before he left Egypt for ever.

It will be seen that most of these considerations adduced by Jahn¹ for the Mosaic authorship, proceed on the false assumption that the Pentateuch was written by Moses himself.

Any combination of the two opinions to which we have referred must be rejected; such as, that the work having been written by Job or some contemporary, fell into Moses's hands while he resided in Midian, was transcribed by him, and slightly altered. There is not the slightest probability that Moses wrote the book of Job. Both the poetry and the philosophy lead to a later time. The reflective genius of the poetry, and the daring tone of the philosophy, argue a more recent period of development. The artificial character of the strophe, the regular parallelism of members, and the rounded completeness in form and features, do not belong to the infancy of the poetic muse. The problem discussed also presupposes a development of the religious consciousness of the nation beyond what the age of Moses witnessed. Reflectiveness had not then attained a high stage. The law alone could have been the means of awakening the deep views of sin, guilt, and punishment which appear in the poem. Indeed the speakers set out from the platform of Mosaism, which they cannot get beyond. It is the leading doctrine of that very Mosaism which the philosophic poet struggles to break through, and arrive at a clearer view of the relation between human suffering and virtue. Both the execution and conception of the poem carry it down much later than Moses—to an age of culture, reflection, and refinement, when incipient and crude attempts in the poetical department had been left far behind. Lyric and gnomic poetry had been cultivated. The author was able to give a highly elaborate and finished form to his work. He must therefore have belonged to a flourishing epoch, or succeeded a time of mental excitement among his people.

3. Keil, Welte, Hävernack, Hahn, Oehler, Hofmann, Vaih-

¹ Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 202 et seqq.

ger, Delitzsch, Schlottmann, after the example of R. Nathan in *Baba bathra* (f. 15), *Sota Jerusalem* (f. 20, 3), Gregory Nazianz., Luther, and Doederlein, refer the poem to the flourishing period of Hebrew poetry or the age of Solomon. Indeed Gregory and Calmet suppose Solomon himself to have been the author. In favour of this have been alleged the following particulars:—

(a) The relation between Prov. i.-ix. and the book. Here are various coincidences shewing contemporaneousness of composition. The description of Wisdom, the representation of Sheol, together with different proverbs and numerous expressions agree. Thus Job v. 17 and Prov. iii. 11; Job xv. 7 and Prov. viii. 25; Job. xxviii. 18 and Prov. iii. 15, strikingly resemble one another. Criticism has now fixed the post-Solomonic origin of chaps. i.-ix. They fall in the period between Solomon and Hezekiah. If so, it cannot be inferred from them that Job was written by one of the wise men belonging to Solomon's court.

It appears to us that the priority does not belong to the book of Job, but to these chapters of the Proverbs. It is said indeed, that the doctrine of the divine wisdom is more developed in the latter than in the former; but we cannot attach any weight to the circumstance that the one speaks more at length of wisdom than the other. The nature of the two works produces the difference. Other coincidences between Job and Proverbs should be attributed to the priority of Proverbs, *as far as any imitation of the one by the other can be discovered*, as Job xxi. 17 and Prov. xiii. 9; xx. 20. Peculiar words and ideas common to both are **עֶלְם** Prov. vii. 18 and Job xx. 18; xxxix. 13. **תַּחְבֻּלוֹת** Job xxxvii. 12 and Prov. i. 5; xi. 14; xx. 18; xxiv. 6. **פִּיר** Job xxx. 24; xxxi. 29; Prov. xxiv. 22. **דָּבַח בַּשַּׁעַר** *to be crushed in the gate*, as a judicial formula, Job v. 4; Prov. xxii. 22. *To drink iniquity like water*, Job xv. 16; xxxiv. 7; Prov. xxvi. 6. **אֶבְרִין** Job xxvi. 6; xxviii. 22; Prov. xv. 11; xxvii. 20 (Ps. lxxxviii. 12). **תוֹשִׁיָּה** Job v. 12; vi. 13; Prov. ii. 12; iii. 21; viii. 14; xviii. 1 (also in Micah vi. 9; Is. xxviii. 29). The two psalms lxxxviii. and lxxxix. are closely allied in ideas and expressions to our book. Thus **קְרָשִׁים** is applied to *angels*, Job v. 1; xv. 15; Ps. lxxxix. 6, 8; also in Zech. xiv. 5. **רְפָאִים** *the shades or manes*, Prov. ii. 18; ix. 18; xxi. 16; Job xxvi. 5; but also in Isaiah. **אֲמִים** *terrors*, Ps. lxxxviii. 16; Prov. xx. 2; Job. xx. 25. **בְּעוֹתִים** *terrors*, Ps. lxxxviii. 17; Job vi. 4. Comp. also both in idea and expression Ps. lxxxix. 38 with Job xvi. 19; Ps. lxxxix. 48 with Job vii. 7; Ps. lxxxix. 49 with Job xiv. 14; Ps. lxxxviii. 5 with Job xiv. 10; Ps. lxxxviii. 9 with

Job xxx. 10; Ps. lxxxix. 8 with Job xxxi. 34. The authors of Ps. lxxxviii. and lxxxix. are said to be the Ezrahites, Heman and Ethan; and they are made contemporaries of Solomon by assuming them to be different persons (1 Kings v. 11) from David's music masters of the same name; which is a very improbable supposition. It can hardly be thought that the relationship between the Psalms and Job was accidental. It is also clear, that the thirty-ninth Psalm has various points of contact with Job; especially the thirteenth verse of it, because the very words and phrases of that verse occur in different parts of Job, as vii. 19; xiv. 6; x. 20, 21; vii. 8, 21. Compare also the sentiment expressed in xxxix. 5 with Job vi. 8-12; vii. 7; xiv. 13; xvi. 21, 22. There is much uncertainty respecting the alleged contemporaneousness of the book of Job with the Solomonic age derived from correspondences in the Psalms referred to and in Job; because the authorship of the former is uncertain. We are inclined to think, that the writer of Job may have seen the Psalms in question. If not, similarity of conception and philosophy in both, may be owing to the nature of the Jewish religion, which did not partake of much development. When their writers touched upon kindred topics, they naturally expressed their ideas alike. In order to establish contemporaneousness of origin, accordance of sentiments and of occasional words is insufficient.

(b) There is a fullness of novel views and images drawn from nature which was first suggested to the Israelites by the commerce of the time. Thus remarkable animals are noticed and described—the river horse, crocodile, ostrich, etc. Precious stones and metals are likewise alluded to as if they were familiar; gold of Ophir, pearls, corals, etc. Surely this argument does not prove the book to have been written in the time of Solomon, but only that it did not precede it. It may still have followed at a considerable interval.

(c) Some later psalms contain reminiscences from Job, as cii., civ., cvii., cxlvii. The use of the book may also be detected in lviii. 9 from Job iii. 16; lviii. 10 from Job xxii. 9; Ps. ciii. 15, 16 from Job vii. 10; xiv. 2. There is an indistinctness in these alleged reminiscences which makes them uncertain. In any case they are of no validity in confirming the assignment of Job's origin to the Solomonic age. Several psalms belonging to the time of the exile may probably present reminiscences out of the book of Job; and so fix its prior composition.

(d) Allusions to the book have been detected in Isaiah and Amos; as Is. xix. 5 compared with Job xiv. 11; Is. xix. 13, 14 compared with Job xii. 24, 25; Is. lix. 4 with Job xv. 35. Amos iv. 13 refers to Job ix. 8; Amos v. 8 to Job ix. 9 and

xxxviii. 31; Amos ix. 6 to Job xii. 15. Here Is. xix. 5 agrees almost verbally with Job xiv. 11, but the former is the original. In like manner xii. 24, 25 is the foundation of Is. xix. 13. Both these places in Isaiah and those in Amos were in the mind of the writer of Job. The prophets in question were used by the later poet; not *vice versa*, as Schlottmann thinks.¹

(e) In the prologue, the Chaldeans appear as a people living by plunder. But they did not present themselves among the Hebrews in that character before the epoch of Hosea king of Judah, and Menahem king of Israel, *i.e.*, about 770 B.C., about the time of Amos and Hosea the prophets.

4. Renan places the poem in the first half of the eighth century. This is too early. The language is not of a character to justify the date. It is not, as he affirms, the most limpid, the most compressed, and the most classical. Isaiah and Amos were both prior to Job, as the passages already referred to attest. Above all, *the philosophy* of the poem, discussed as it is from so high a stand-point, evinces a later time, when reflectiveness had reached another stage than that which characterised the eighth century.²

5. The book belongs to the beginning of the seventh century before Christ, not earlier. This is the opinion of Ewald, Heiligstedt, Magnus, and appears to us the most probable. In favour of it we may adduce:—

(a) Passages shewing that foreigners had already penetrated into the country, depriving the Israelites in part of the territory which belonged to them as the possession promised to the fathers; and that persons who retained the wisdom of the fathers in its purity were seldom to be met with. Thus ix. 24 “the land is given into the hand of the oppressor: he covereth the faces of the judges thereof,” etc.; xii. 6, “the tabernacles of robbers prosper; and they that provoke God are secure,” etc.; xv. 18, etc., “which wise men have told from their fathers and have not hid it. Unto whom alone the earth was given, and no stranger passed among them,” etc. The times were degenerate. The power of the nation was broken. Misfortunes had existed for a considerable period. The pious were dispirited by the gloomy aspect of affairs. They were oppressed by calamities, and witnessed with sorrow corrupt morals and perverted justice. Hence such questions as, “Wherefore do the wicked live, become old, yea are mighty in power” (xxi. 7), and, “Wherefore are not evil times hoarded up by the Almighty, and wherefore do his worshippers not behold his days of judgment,” etc. (xxiv. 1); and descriptions like, “He increaseth the nations and

¹ Das Buch Hiob verdeutscht und erläutert, Einleitung, p. 109.

² Le livre de Job traduit de l'Hebreu, Etude sur le poeme de Job, p. xli.

destroyeth them : he enlargeth the nations and straiteneth them again. He taketh away the heart of the chief of the people of the earth, and causeth them to wander in a wilderness where there is no way. They grope in the dark without light, and he maketh them to stagger like a drunken man " (xii. 23-25), betray a disordered state of the nation, and point to the final history of Judah. The experience of the writer's own life is portrayed, in connection with the sorrows of his countrymen.

(b) Jeremiah, whose prophecies are characterised by much imitation, presupposes the existence of our book. Thus xx. 14-18 we read : " Cursed be the day wherein I was born : let not the day whercin my mother bare me be blessed. Cursed be the man who brought tidings to my father, saying, A man child is born unto thee ; making him very glad. And let that man be as the cities which the Lord overthrew and repented not : and let him hear the cry in the morning and the shouting at noontide ; because he slew me not from the womb ; or that my mother might have been my grave, and her womb to be always great with me," etc. etc., comp. Job iii. 3-10. Jer. xvii. 1, " The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron and with the point of a diamond : it is graven upon the table of their heart, and upon the horns of your altars," compare Job xix. 24. Jer. xx. 7, 8, " O Lord thou hast deceived me and I was deceived : thou art stronger than I and hast prevailed : I am in derision daily, every one mocketh me. For since I spake I cried out, I cried violence and spoil ; because the word of the Lord was made a reproach unto me, and a derision, daily," comp. Job xii. 4, xix. 7. Lam. ii. 16, " All thine enemies have opened their mouth against me : they hiss and gnash the teeth : they say, We have swallowed her up : certainly this is the day that we looked for ; we have found, we have seen it," comp. Job xvi. 9, 10, xxvii. 23. Lam. iii. 7-9, " He hath hedged me about that I cannot get out : he hath made my chain heavy. Also when I cry and shout, he shutteth out my prayer. He hath enclosed my ways with hewn stone, he hath made my paths crooked," comp. Job xix. 7, 8. Lam. iii. 14, " I was a derision to all my people ; and their song all the day," comp. Job xxx. 9. Lam. iii. 15, " He hath filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood," comp. Job ix. 18.¹ In Job xxi. 19 the statement is combated that if the godless himself does not receive the punishment due to his deeds, his children must pay the penalty ; and the idea is first expressed that the wicked himself should suffer for his own sins, and not the son for the father. Accordingly Jeremiah founds a promise on the idea, viz., that every one

¹ Comp. Kueper, *Jeremias* S. S. interpres. p. 164 et seqq.

shall bear his own iniquity (xxx. 29, 30); and Ezek. xviii. 1 pronounces the doctrine, hitherto current, erroneous and antiquated.

(c) The general character of the language agrees best with this time. It bears a few marks of decay, like that of *the later*, not the exile books.

(d) The position which the poem occupies in the religious development of the Hebrew people points to the same period. The subject of it was not new. It had already entered into the speculative mind of the Hebrews, and received discussion. We know from earlier Scriptures how it had been treated. Prior theological speculation respecting theodicy may be seen in various psalms. Here the idea of the book appears in a farther state of development. It is advanced another stage in harmony with the still later period of the nation and its increasing disasters. It is directly opposed to fact to affirm that Job belongs to a school of thought prevalent at the era of David and Solomon. The allusions and affinities of the book are indeed partly made to the productions of this period; but they are slight things in the discussion of the problem itself. The development of the problem is beyond anything in the Proverbs, Psalms, or earlier prophets; and instead of being inconsistent with a later time than Solomon's plainly requires it.¹

We have thus fixed upon the beginning of the seventh century B.C. as the most probable time of composition.

6. Others think that the work was composed during or after the exile. Le Clerc, Grotius, Warburton, Gesenius, Bernstein, Knobel, Hartmann, Vatke, and others advocate this; the two last-mentioned critics reducing it even to the fifth century, which is totally incorrect. In favour of it are alleged:—

(a) The Aramaicisms, which are collected in great numbers by Bernstein.² But the list should be sifted, because the majority of forms and expressions so designated are peculiarities of the poetical style, which frequently employs a foreign mode of utterance by way of ornament; and is compelled by the parallelism of ideas to invade the domain of the Aramaean dialect. Were more poems of the same length extant, the proportion of such foreign peculiarities of speech would not appear so great or remarkable. In poetry the differences of dialect are not so marked as in prose. Genuine Aramaicisms are, the orthography of יִשְׁרָאֵל viii. 8; נָהָר xx. 25; xxxiii. 17; see Daniel iv. 34; כְּאֵין xxxi. 7; Daniel i. 4; נְכֹאֵי xxx. 8; רִים xxxix. 9; חֵין xli. 4; the use of ל to denote the accusative, v. 2; xxi. 22; of

¹ Comp. Stähelin *Specielle Einleitung*, p. 443 et seqq.

² Ueber das Buch Hiob, in Keil and Tzachirner's *Analecta*, I. 3, p. 109 et seqq.

for אל xxii. 2; xxxi. 5, 9; קבל ii. 10; שד for שד xxiv. 9; נריב xxi. 28 in a bad sense, synonymous with רשע. רשע in the sense of *business, employment*, xxi. 21; xxii. 3; see Eccl. iii. 1; v. 7; viii. 6; נזר to *decide*, xxii. 28; comp. Esther ii. 1; אהו to *shut*, xxvi. 9; comp. Neh. vii. 3. Such is a list of the Aramaicisms used by Job. They are wholly insufficient to prove the exile or post-exile origin of the work. As well might Arabisms be collected to prove the Arabic original of the poem. This indeed was once done. The alleged Arabisms are now justly discarded. And there are no more Aramaicisms than avail to prove the degeneracy of the language—a degeneracy produced, among other things, by foreign influences. Only ignorance can assert that they *all* characterise the antique and highly poetic style.

(b) The spirit in which the book is conceived favours the time of the captivity. "A pious Israelite," says Umbreit, "in the land of the enemy, mourning under the willows of the Euphrates on which he hung the harps of his native minstrelsy, feels in his manly bosom all the agony of unmerited affliction. But he does not belong to the class of those who, like David and Asaph, can breathe forth their sorrows in soft elegiac measure; and still less does he resemble that highest and holiest One of all, who in mute submission opened not his mouth except to pray for his persecutors. The feelings of his severe and lofty mind find more natural utterance in the strains of philosophic poetry, in which he perpetuates his patriotic grief."¹ These very just remarks are as applicable to the state of Judah not long before the captivity as after it. They suit a pious poet in the one period of his country's history as well as the other.

(c) The poem is supposed to have a national reference and tendency. Warburton thought that under the type of Job, the writer meant to describe the suffering Jewish nation.² But this hypothesis is justly exploded, because irreconcilable with the hero's strongly asserted innocence. Yet we are not disposed to deny all such national reference. While the individuality of the writer as well as of Job himself must be maintained, the sufferings of his countrymen affected the author's mind. There is a disheartening view of human life, which probably originated in the time of suffering. But that time need not have been the very time of exile. A period of national depression and degeneracy, such as Judah had at the beginning of the seventh century, harmonises better with the poem than the captivity itself. It is a mere assumption when Umbreit says, that the

¹ A new version of the book of Job, translated by Gray, vol. i. Introd. pp. 38, 39.

² Divine Legation of Moses; Works, vol. v. p. 67.

end, in which compensation is announced to the innocent for their sufferings, was added by the author after Cyrus had inspired the Hebrews with the hope of a return from captivity.¹

(d) The ideas of the book respecting Satan and angels are thought to be of late origin. Many critics have supposed that the Hebrew doctrine of Satan is of Chaldaic-Persic origin. The malignant spirit so called, was derived from the Babylonians at the time of the captivity. Others have tried to shew, that the prince of darkness in the oriental mythology was not transferred to the Jews at that period. The question is a very difficult one. We are disposed to believe, that the introduction of such a personification belongs to a time prior to the captivity. As to the notions of angels presented in the book before us, it is certainly true that they are late; but it cannot be shewn that they are so late as the captivity. The point is, Were the representations of Satan and angels here given, of foreign origin, and borrowed from the Chaldeans or Persians *not sooner than the time of the exile?* Their foreign birth *at that era* has not been proved. Indeed the foreign birth of the conception of *angels* may be questioned. We know no reason for denying the purely Semitic origin of the *sons of God*, in which conception angels are here included. And we are willing to admit, that the Satan of the book is not the Ahriman of Avesta; because he is not the genius of evil existing and acting by himself. The idea of Satan was not so far developed under Eastern Asiatic influences till the captivity. In Job it appears in an incipient state, having been recently transferred from the East.

The works belonging to the post-exile period have a very different character from Job. They breathe another spirit, and exhibit a rigid Mosaism. Judaism had then lost its liberty and flexibility. It had become severe and ceremonial. Such bold apostrophes and vehement protestations of innocence as are put into Job's mouth were totally opposed to the spirit of the period; and would have appeared blasphemous in the eyes of the pious. The taste for theophanies, like those found in the poem, had disappeared. The breath of original inspiration had forsaken the nation.

The style and language are too pure for the captivity-time. Aramaeism is not impressed on them. The decay of the diction is not very perceptible, except in Elihu's discourses. It certainly *is* perceptible, though in its incipient state. Yet all the qualities of ancient style are found, such as conciseness, energy, tendency to enigma, numerous difficulties, and absence of clearness. Umbreit says, that the individual taste of the poet led

¹ Version of the book of Job, vol. i. p. 39.

him to employ antique forms of speech ; and that he was anxious to preserve the purity of the language. We greatly doubt if any author of the exile time could have done so in the same degree.

General assertions respecting the time of its composition, as those of Carey and others, "whether Job himself was the compiler of the book, and when and by whom it was introduced into the canon of Scripture, whether by Moses after his sojourn in Midian, or by David after his victories over the Edomites, are questions about which I conceive it to be impossible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion ;"¹—such assertions betray nothing else than want of perception in ascertaining the true date. Satisfactory evidence shews, that the time we have assigned is pretty near the truth. If perfunctory critics undertake to write on the book, it is not surprising that they either go astray, or lose themselves in generalities lest they do so. Those therefore who speak about the possibility of only *guessing* the time when the poem was written, convey a false impression of the case. It was certainly later than Solomon, and as certainly earlier than the exile. Between these limits true criticism will soon fix the proper date, to half a century.

VIII. UNITY AND INTEGRITY.—Although the work presents the appearance of a complete and finished whole, it has not been allowed to retain its well-rounded form intact. The edge of criticism has cut into it, in order to shew its partial disunity. This arises in part from inattention to the different ideas of the orientals and us respecting composition. They had not the same regard for logical sequence and perfect symmetry as modern writers in the West. Where we discover defects of sequence that mar the perfection of a work, they were not concerned to avoid incongruities and interruptions. There is therefore a danger of transferring our ideas to them, and so judging by a false standard. Criticism has been less timid on this point than it ought to have been.

1. Some have disputed the genuineness of the prologue and epilogue, as R. Simon, A. Schultens, Hasse, Stuhlmann, Bernstein, Knobel, Magnus ; Heiligstedt in part (Prologue i. 6-12 ; ii. 1-7).

(a) It has been objected to these pieces, embracing chaps. i., ii., xlii. 7-17, that they are in prose, while the rest of the work is in poetry ; and that the name of *Jehovah* occurs in them, while He is termed אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִי, or שְׁרִי in the poem itself. To this it may be replied, that the narrative requires prose, because there is no rythmical narration to be found in Hebrew. Prose

¹ The book of Job, translated, explained, and illustrated, Dissert. iv.

is the constant vehicle of a narrative. It is apparent that the poetical *element* is in the prologue because the heavenly scene depicted is the creation of a rich imagination. The names of Deity are designedly chosen, and adapted both to the persons using them and the scene of the drama. The writer himself, as an Israelite, employs the genuine theocratic name *Jehovah*, where he speaks in his own person. Hence this appellation appears, not only in the prologue and epilogue, but in xxxviii. 1; xl. 1, 3, 6; xlii. 1. But where Job and his friends are introduced as speaking, they cannot with propriety use *Jehovah* because they belonged to the patriarchal time when that appellation was unknown. Hence we find them using the old name *El* or *Eloah*, and *Shaddai*. The only exceptions to this are i. 21 in the prologue, where Job speaks and has יְהוָה; and in xii. 9, xxxviii. 28, where the writer betrays his nation.

(b) In both great stress is laid on sacrifices; whereas in the poem itself everything theocratic is avoided. But surely sacrifices were frequent in the patriarchal time, to which the hero of the book belongs.

(c) The prologue and epilogue disagree, in some respects, with various phenomena in the poem itself; as that Job is a model of patience, all his words being full of humble submission to the Divine will, and his misfortunes having no power to wrest a blasphemous expression from his lips; while as soon as he begins to speak in verse, his language becomes arrogant, defiant, and almost impious. Hence it is thought that the prologue appeared at an epoch devoted to the worship of *Jehovah*; whereas the poem implies very great religious freedom. In the epilogue he is pronounced *righteous* in opposition to the three friends; but in the work itself, he charges the Almighty with injustice. God there approves of Job, and acknowledges that he has spoken well of Him; whereas in the poem He censures him severely, and taxes him with folly. The idea of the poem is also said to be inconsistent with the epilogue, because the latter holds forth the doctrine of divine retribution, asserting the invariable connection between virtue and prosperity, crime and misfortune, and giving Job a double recompence for his sufferings; whereas the poet's object is to oppose this doctrine. Job's children also are supposed to be alive, in different parts of the work, while in the prologue they perish.

These statements are based on partial misapprehension of the work. The piety of Job is prominent throughout. He had spoken concerning God what was well-founded, viz., that though his sufferings were inflicted by God they were unmerited. But amid increasing pain and struggling doubts he is tempted to give utterance to a few hasty expressions, for which he is after-

wards sorry. An occasional word wrung from him by pain should not be regarded as the index of his usual disposition. In xix. 17, where Job's children are supposed to be alive, contrary to the prologue, the right interpretation appears to be, "My wife is weary of my complaining, and the children (grand-children) of my body are sick of my sorrowing." This is preferable to the meaning of *בָּנָי בְּרָאִי* which makes it *my brethren*; though the latter is adopted by Stuhlmann, Gesenius, Umbreit, and Winer; because brethren were already mentioned (ver. 13), and a wife is better associated with the mention of *children* than *brothers*. In xxxi. 8, the word *בְּרָאִי* signifies *what Job had planted*, not his *children*. Both prologue and epilogue seem necessary to the completeness of the work, and inseparable from it; because the former intimates the nature of the problem which the author is about to discuss by shewing the cause of Job's trial; while the absence of the latter would leave the reader in the dark as to Job's fate.¹

2. Another piece which has been called in question is chaps. xxvii. 7-xxviii. 28. Kennicott perceiving the apparent contradiction between Job's admissions in xxvii. 13-23, that there is a divine retribution in this world, and his former assertions in xii. 6, xxi., xxiv. 22, etc., respecting the continued, unbroken prosperity of the wicked, and unable to solve it, assigned xxvii. 13-23 to Zophar, who had only spoken twice before, not three times like the other friends. In this conjecture he was followed by Eichhorn and Bertholdt.² So Stuhlmann makes Zophar's speech begin at the eleventh verse, and attributes chap. xxviii. to Bildad.³ Bernstein declared the whole xxvii. 7-xxviii. 8, to be a later addition;⁴ while Knobel regarded the twenty-eighth chapter alone as spurious.⁵ Eichhorn and Boeckel imagined that although ver. 13-23 belong to Job, he does not express his own sentiments in them but simply sums up those of his friends. The incongruity which has led so many critics to question the genuineness of the two chapters in whole or in part, arises from misapprehending the true scope and meaning of their contents. Job had formerly argued that evil-doers often prospered in this life in opposition to the favourite doctrine of his friends who maintained the invariable connection between sin and misfortune, virtue and prosperity, and taunted him accordingly with his calamities as a proof of guilt. Having reduced them to silence by this defensive process he can now calmly allow the

¹ See Bleek's *Einleitung*, pp. 654, 655.

² *Dissertatio generalis*, ed. Bruns, p. 539.

³ *Uebersetzung des Buches Hiob*, p. 76 et seqq.

⁴ In Keil and Tzschirner's *Analecta*, p. 133 et seqq.

⁵ *De carmine Jobi argum. fin. et dispositione*, etc. p. 27 et seqq.

truth of his friends' favourite doctrine, viz., that the wicked fall into misfortune, without holding that every unprosperous man is also wicked. The former may be assented to, while the latter is denied. Hence in xxvii. 13-23 he describes in strong colours the fate of the godless as his friends had done, after blaming them for always applying the maxim to himself in an illogical way: "all ye yourselves have rightly observed" (ver. 11), this is the concession: "wherefore then will ye busy yourselves with vanity?" this is the opposition to their application of the doctrine to himself. In the twenty-eighth chapter he refers them to the unsearchable depths of the divine wisdom and the limitations of human knowledge.

The twenty-eighth chapter cannot, as Bernstein thinks, have proceeded from him who wrote Elihu's discourses, on the supposition that the Elihu-portion was later than the rest of the book; because there is no apparent motive for such an insertion. The chapter contains one of the finest developments of the poem. We believe that nothing in the two chapters can be probably assigned to any other than the author of the poem.

3. The section xl. 15-xli. 26 containing descriptions of the hippopotamus and crocodile has been suspected, or rejected as spurious, by various critics. Eichhorn, Ewald, Meier, declare it spurious; though Stuhlmann and Bernstein merely think xli. 4-26 a later addition; and Bertholdt¹ affirms that it is not in its right place, but should be immediately after xl. 31. The reasons are stated to be:—

Its position. It belongs to the second discourse of Jehovah, which has for its object the answering of Job's doubts respecting the righteousness of God; whereas this description of animals can only serve to depict Jehovah's power, which is the object of the first speech of the Almighty. It is man's relation to the problem of the divine righteousness, not that of the animal creation, which is appropriate. Besides, the object of Jehovah's second discourse is completed by xl. 6-14; where the conclusion is rounded off and clear. The discourse beginning with xl. 15, etc., should be shorter than the first, because the present place is not suitable for an expansion of the theme, nor are preparations made for it. There is no internal bond of connection between it and xl. 6-14, not even the loosest. An easy external transition is wanting. Hence the piece should rather be placed after the thirty-ninth chapter. And there are internal marks which shew that it did not proceed from the old poet himself. We look here in vain for the flowing, tender ease of the descriptions in the thirty-ninth chapter. The portraits of the two

¹ Einleitung, vol. v. p. 2164.

animals are diffusely drawn, with a tediousness which strives in vain after sharpness and compression, unlike the images projected broadly and copiously in the thirty-ninth chapter. We do not meet here with the springing irony, or the surprising flight of the figures in xxxviii., xxxix. Jehovah is almost entirely lost sight of. We scarcely recognise him even afar off, with the thunder of his presence and speaking in majesty. Such passages as xl. 15*a*., 19*b*., xli. 2, 3, are but feeble attempts at a divine down-thundering discourse, in opposition to the clear, penetrating fire in xxxviii., xxxix.; and therefore the whole, compared with those types, bears the obvious impression of imitation. The language too deviates considerably from the older poem; the words and forms which it has in common with the latter being imitated from it.¹

Here it is incorrectly assumed that the divine attributes of omnipotence and righteousness are treated apart in the two speeches of Jehovah xxxviii., xxxix., and xl. This is not so. There is not so sharp a separation between the objects of the two discourses as Ewald assumes. The omnipotence of God is referred to in xl. 9-14, immediately after Job is challenged respecting his righteousness (7 and 8.) The difference of style merely shews the art of the poet in giving an appropriate form to each of his pictures. The style is not inferior at times to that of the best passages in the poem. Vigour of stroke and sonorousness of parallelism remind the reader of the same hand as that which produced the rest of the work. Some connection too may be traced between xl. 14 and what follows. He that feels himself tempted to undertake the government of the world in place of God as if he could manage it better, must first be sure that he is able to master and lead at his pleasure the monsters of the animal world. Can Job do this? It is easy to resolve similar expressions and forms into imitation; but subjective taste and ingenuity are capable of converting proofs of the same authorship into none. Comp. עֲפֵעֵי-שָׁחַר xli. 10 with iii. 9; בְּגִי-שָׁחַץ xli. 26 with xxviii. 8; יִצּוֹק xli. 15, 16 with מִצָּק xi. 15; the form עָשָׂה xli. 25 with צָפָה xv. 22; כָּרָה עַל xl. 30 with vi. 27; הִתְלַכָּר xli. 9 with xxxviii. 30. It is vain to look out in every part of the poem for such symmetry and consistency as the acuteness of criticism may now require.²

4. The only other passage which has been called in question is that containing the discourses of Elihu, chaps. xxxii.-xxxvii. Against their genuineness it has been said:—

¹ See Ewald in the Studien und Kritiken for 1829, p. 766 et seqq.

² See Hirzel's Hiob, pp. 248, 249; and Umbreit in the Studien und Kritiken for 1831, p. 833 et seqq.

(a) Elihu is not mentioned in the prologue or epilogue; nor is judgment pronounced upon his speeches, as it is on those of the other three. This is the more remarkable because Elihu's speeches rest on the same ground as the rest, viz., that Job suffers for his guilt; and therefore the same reproof should be given to them (xlii. 7).

(b) These discourses remove the connection between Job's last discourse and that of the Almighty in the thirty-eighth chapter. The commencement of the latter necessarily implies that Job had spoken immediately before: "who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge;" and in like manner, the interrupted close of Job's speech (xxxi. 40) can only be explained by assuming that he was stopped by Jehovah in the course of his address. Of course the phrase "the words of Job are ended" (xxxi. 40) are a late addition, not being in the LXX. or Vulgate.

(c) Not only do they weaken the speech of Jehovah by anticipating in xxxvi., xxxvii. the appeal to the divine power and wisdom, but they make it superfluous because they give the solution of the problem in the way of knowledge; while Jehovah demands unconditional subjection to his Almighty power and hidden wisdom. Why should this demand be made if it be known that sufferings are a means of moral purification, as here represented (xxxiii.-xxxvi.)?

(d) Elihu misunderstands or perverts the language of Job xxxiv. 9, xxxv. 3).

(e) Elihu mentions Job by name; but the three friends do not (xxxiii. 1, 31; xxxvii. 14).

(f) There is a striking contrast between the manner in which Elihu and the three are introduced. Prolixity and drawling characterise the former's entrance upon the scene; the latter are simply announced.

(g) These speeches occupy an isolated position. Job does not reply to them, though he repels the criminations of the three as often as they are repeated. He does not defend himself against Elihu, who blames him as well as the rest; but submits to the charge.

(h) The language and style are perceptibly different from the rest of the book. The Aramaean colouring is stronger. Expressions, forms, and modes of speech occur, for which others are uniformly employed in the remainder of the poem. The dictionary of the author is an unusual one. Not only are various words which he seems to have a liking for not found in the discourses of the other speakers; they do not appear in other Hebrew books. It is true that in a language like the Hebrew every author has a sort of vocabulary of his own—a

circle of words which characterises himself—but there are features of style that form a decisive criterion of authorship. In like manner imitations appear, not only in the whole section xxxvi. 28-xxxvii. 18 founded upon and suggested by the discourses of the Almighty in chaps. xxxviii., etc., but also in single ideas and expressions.

These arguments are not all alike valid. Some of them singly are inconsiderable and weak. Together, however, they are of force. We shall endeavour to estimate them respectively according to their value.

1. We attach little importance to the fact that Elihu is not mentioned in the prologue. It does not seem necessary to the plan or symmetry of the poem that he should be introduced there, because he occupies a somewhat different position from that of Job's three friends. That he is not noticed however in the *epilogue* is strange. The other speakers are referred to and blamed for having spoken things not right. Why should not Elihu have been treated in the same way? It may be thought that he spake the truth, and could not therefore have been censured like the rest. But did he so? What ground does he take different from those who preceded him? Does he solve the problem? Or does the germ of the solution lie in his sentiments? No adequate solution of it occurs in all that he says. He certainly carries it forward a step towards solution, and so far exceeds the previous speakers. Yet he utters sentiments deserving reprehension as well as theirs; for he regards Job's misfortunes as the result of his iniquity, though also maintaining the position that the misfortunes of the righteous should be considered a mean for their attaining greater moral excellence and purification. Thus he takes the same ground *essentially* as the rest, and ought not to be unrebuked.

2. The argument that the introduction of Jehovah's discourse implies that Job had just spoken is sound and valid, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" (xxxviii. 2). These words refer to Job, not to Elihu. In like manner the discourse of Job in xxxi. 38-40 is suddenly cut short, as we may suppose it to have been by the Almighty's interference in the dialogue. "It cannot be denied," says Umbreit, "that the omission of the following verses could have tended to give a more perfect finish to this last discourse of Job's, and that the thirty-seventh verse would have been an extremely suitable close to the whole."¹ The whole piece has no proper connection with the older work into which it is inserted, either internally or externally; and might be absent without perceptible

¹ Job translated by Gray, vol. ii. p. 198.

abridgment or mutilation of the whole. Schlottmann's attempt to shew its perfect adaptation to the context in which it stands is unsuccessful.²

3. Elihu's discourses appear to us to render unnecessary in part, the appeal to the divine power and wisdom. Thus chaps. xxxvi. and xxxvii. are an echo of xxxviii.-xli. The imitation indeed is general, consisting in ideas rather than words, and is far inferior to the original; yet it is sufficiently perceptible. They also give a solution of the problem proposed which makes that contained in the discourse of Deity superfluous. Going beyond the latter, they represent suffering as a means of moral purification, and therefore there is no need to inculcate unqualified submission to His omnipotence and hidden wisdom. Elihu prepares the way in some measure for the appearance of Deity; but his words are not a natural introduction to the speech of the latter. They shew at length what Jehovah expresses more briefly. In this manner they weaken the effect of what succeeds. No single idea *absolutely* new appears. The older work has a germ of thought at least corresponding to any that can be pointed out. We admit that there is a more developed representation of the connection between sin and suffering, but that is consistent with our statement.

4. The writer of Elihu's discourses perverts, and draws unfair inferences from, Job's language. He does so at xxxiv. 9, where he represents Job as expressing himself thus: "It profiteth not a man that he should be at peace with God." But it is certain that such a sentiment was never uttered by the sufferer in this unqualified and strong language. Again in xxxv. 2 the sentiment controverted by Elihu, viz., that the sufferer conscious of integrity may say that piety has been of no service to him, is an unfair deduction from Job's speeches. It is improbable that the original poet who himself put such discourses into Job's mouth, would have caused Elihu to pervert the meaning of any part of them. Another author might readily do so.

5. The style and language are peculiar, differing remarkably from those of the remainder. Expressions, word-forms, modes of speech occur, for which others are as uniformly found in the older work. The diction is more strongly Aramaean, rough, heavy, prolix, difficult. Thus we meet with עַתָּה for עַתָּה xxxii. 6; וְחַל *ibid*; אַבְנִי *but*, ver. 8; נָעַר for נַעֲרִים xxxvi. 14; עֵל

for עֵלָה xxxiv. 10, 32; בְּנָה with אֵל xxxii. 21; אֲבִי xxxiv. 36; מַעֲבָד in the sense of *doings* xxxiv. 25; חָף xxxiii. 9;

קֶרֶן *to form like a potter* xxxiii. 6;

² Das Buch Hiob, u. s. w. Einleit. p. 58, et seqq.

xxxiii. 10; חַיָּה *life* for חַיִּים xxxiii. 18, 22, 28; חָלַל *to wait* xxxv. 14. What compels the assumption of another poet is not so much single words and expressions as the general character of the whole, shewing a man far inferior in poetical ability. He never reaches the height or fullness of the older work. Bold images, lofty thoughts, lively pictures, all that richness of conception and inexhaustible copiousness of appropriate language which bespeak a master genius in the rest of the book, are absent. Instead of this we are struck with the effort of one striving to reach the height of the older poet, and straining after an ideal for which he is naturally unequal; whose imagination, incapable of bolder flight, forces prose to do the duty of poetry, and supplies no succession of new images. Even after the verbose and tiresome introduction, tautologies do not cease. Instead of the master's stamp evinced in the distinct characters and appropriate language of the three friends, we see the struggling of one trying to follow the higher flights of his predecessor. The tone is fallen and flat in comparison; the style cold and pretentious. Hence the writer loses himself in long descriptions destitute of vivacity, as at chapter xxxvi. 26, etc. etc., which contrasts unfavourably with the words of Jehovah himself. It cannot be said that the obscurity of the language arises from our ignorance: it springs out of the style itself, which is odd and affected.

There is little doubt that Elihu is a creation of the poet's imagination, and therefore it is beside the mark to account for the Aramaean colouring of his words by the fact of his being an Aramaean. Those who so explain his Aramacisms, should first shew that he was a historical person. All the replies offered to this weighty argument are insufficient and unsatisfactory. The difference of style and language in the discourses of the other speakers can hardly be compared with the distinctive peculiarities of Elihu, because they do no violence to the unity of the older work. One master mind is clearly observable, amid all the diversities of the three speakers. The distinctiveness of Elihu's language is of another character. Nor can the peculiarities of Elihu be the mere creation of the same poet who is seen in the rest of the book, or arise from the art of the author. It is true that every speaker has his own manner and style; that Elihu's appearance is strikingly marked; and that he was a young man occupying a different relation to Job from that of the other speakers. But though such peculiarities require a corresponding style of utterance, they ought still to shew the same poet as the speeches of the three friends; especially as those friends, and Job himself, speak in the same style. A heavy style is hardly suited to the character of Elihu, who had suffi-

cient self-confidence, forwardness, and vanity. Youthful fire should have breathed throughout his discourses; whereas they are prolix and heavy. Even if he is described as a conceited babbler whom the author sets forth in a ridiculous light, as some suppose, they are scarcely appropriate. Such an one, possessing great talent united to juvenile presumption, would not speak as he does; for although he might occasionally have a mystified manner, he would scarcely betray the tedious efforts to body forth his ideas in the genuine poetic strain. Rather should he be characterised by an exuberant imagination bursting over the barriers of a legitimate sobriety into the domain of the bombastic. His fancy should be wild and unbridled; whereas it is the absence of this characteristic—the very prosaic conception and style—that appears in Elihu. Youthful fire and presumption do not manifest themselves in drawling and laboured speech having the marks of imitation written legibly upon its face. The plan of the poet could not have been to write in such a style, as long as Elihu's person is what it is. These remarks shew the impossibility of accounting for Elihu's style by the author's desire to mark his individuality and personal character. Besides, poetry of a high antiquity does not know fine shades of characters. It paints men and life in broad outline. To make each person speak in a particular style is a token of advanced art.

We believe it impossible to make the speeches of Elihu proceed from the older poet and suppose them a constituent part of his work. Their place after chap. xxxi., where they are unsuitable, and where Job must have replied to them because they are largely unjust to him; the impropriety of making *a man* confute Job, whereas he can only be instructed and humbled by *Jehovah*; and the whole style of thought and expression coincide in rejecting the same authorship as that of the rest of the poem. Yet there is merit in the piece. A certain progression of ideas is observable. At first the negative, then the affirmative appears. The obvious gradually passes into the more remote. The ideas expressed are true, correct, pure. In some respects they go beyond those of the older poet. His natural philosophy is farther advanced than that observable in the thirty-eighth and following chapters. Thus Jehovah asks with patriarchal simplicity, "hath the rain a father?" (xxxviii. 28); whereas Elihu knows that it proceeds from the watery vapours that form clouds and afterwards distil in little drops upon men (xxxvi. 27, 28). In like manner, his ethical philosophy is riper than that of Job and the three friends; his moral ideas more refined. But the breath of genius is wanting. The advancement observable is the reflection of his time, rather than of the individual

man at the head of his contemporaries. His views of divine things are often profounder and more comprehensive. They are even set forth more strikingly. This indeed was natural, since he had the advantage of a later development. It is only by comparison that the piece suffers as a whole, because it is good in itself, notwithstanding inferiority of style and diction. The depths of sin are evidently apprehended in a more evangelical light by the writer of the Elihu-section than by the older poet. The latter stands on the giddy height of the truth that there are human sufferings uncaused by antecedent actual sin, with a boldness which makes us tremble; for the unqualified maintenance of the position is dangerous as well as daring; but the former, with profounder insight into man's moral corruption and the remains of inherent depravity existing in the most pious, finds it difficult to reconcile the position of his predecessor with his own consciousness; and therefore inserts an element which throws light upon the sufferings of the righteous approaching the New Testament splendour. Thus the ways of God towards man can be indicated in proportion to the nature of the view taken of sin. Man's *comparative* not *absolute* innocence, even at his best, should be apprehended as a great fact. The deep depravity of human nature must be felt before the righteousness of God can be reconciled with the sufferings of the righteous.

In holding the later origin of this part of the book we are glad to be associated with the best Hebrew critics: with Eichhorn, Stuhlmann, Bernstein, Hirzel, Knobel, De Wette, Ewald, E. Meier, Magnus, Heiligstedt, Hupfeld, Delitzsch, Bleek, Renan, and others. Those who wish to see what Stickel, Schlottmann, Hahn, Havernick, Keil, Welte and others have to say in defence of the authenticity will find an abstract of their arguments in Stähelin.¹

How long after the older poet the author of Elihu's discourses wrote, it is impossible to say. A century at least must be assumed. It must not for a moment be thought, that the author of the poem himself resumed his pen after a long interval, thinking he could perfect it by the addition of the piece. Such a conjecture on the part of Renan, is most unfortunate. In that case, a few simple changes in the rest of the poem would have made it fit in, without its present incongruity.² What led this unknown person to the undertaking was the existence of many things in Job which appeared objectionable and offensive; especially as they are strongly uttered, without due limitation. These ideas, bordering as they do on the irreverent and blas-

¹ *Specielle Einleitung*, u. s. w., p. 436 et seqq.

² *Le Livre de Job, Etude sur le poeme*, p. lvii.

phemous, must have been a stumbling-block to pious minds—an offence to the sober and thoughtful. Not that there is anything objectionable in them which is not turned aside either by Job himself, or by the Almighty after His appearance. But the refutation is not palpable or plain enough. A more effectual, intentional contradiction seemed desirable. This is what the writer undertook at a time when reverence for divine things had increased. He wished to supply the felt want, and so render the wonderful poem more acceptable to the minds of his countrymen in an age of national decline. Although, therefore, he felt that the work proceeded from a master spirit soaring far beyond any other poet of his nation in loftiness of thought and power of imagination, he was not deterred from the task of adding to it; because his purpose was to make it more accessible to the calm apprehension of the earnest minds of the day. His aim was upright and good. Lofty in its reach as the older production was, it exhibited a daring sublimity bordering on irreverence. Hence, although wanting in equal inspiration, he was not afraid to improve the work by the insertion of such things as should distinctly refute the unqualified protestations of Job respecting his innocence, and his charges against the Almighty himself. The insertion was readily received as being more accordant with religious consciousness, and more consolatory to the suffering nation.

Is there any idea absolutely new in Elihu's discourses? What is the precise relation they bear to those of the three friends, in respect of thought? The former question cannot be answered in the affirmative. Eliphaz had said, "Behold, happy is the man whom God correcteth: therefore despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty," and Elihu expands the idea. But he does it in a way that shews no compassion for the sufferer. He is cold and disputative; not saying expressly that Job is a true servant of God, but rather treating him as one who had blasphemed the Almighty. Hence he affords no consolation to Job. The fundamental idea of the speeches of Elihu, as well as of the friends seems to be, that suffering always points to sin. It is inseparable from that sinfulness which cleaves to human nature; and must therefore contribute to the amelioration of the righteous. But in the three, the idea is always associated with strict retribution; and is not carried out to its legitimate consequences. In Elihu, the idea is developed so as to shew that suffering is a means of purifying. The *corrective* nature of suffering is dwelt upon more than its *retributive* character. Divine retribution recedes into the back ground; while the ameliorating aspect is prominently adduced. Thus while the one idea lies at the foundation of all the speeches, it is variously

apprehended and adduced. The darker aspect of it is brought out by the three; the more evangelical one by Elihu. The latter goes deeper and more comprehensively into the question, by coming nearer the New Testament; while the former stand on Old Testament ground alone. *In essence* their doctrine is the same; yet it is so differently treated as to make it dissimilar. The development is much better in the case of Elihu's discourses. Indeed the development in the mouth of the three friends hardly advances a step. Retribution in the present life stands out strongly in all they say; the moral influence of affliction being only touched upon by Eliphaz, as if he apprehended it indistinctly. Elihu gives this subjective aspect of affliction a prominence which shews the higher philosophy he had reached. Thus in looking at human suffering the stress laid upon divine retribution and purifying power is reversed by the three friends of Job, and by Elihu.

If the preceding observations be correct it follows that the character of Elihu has been greatly misapprehended by various critics. Jerome regards him as the representative of a philosophy which is hostile to faith, and false; Gregory the Great, as a self-conceited prater. The latter view has been taken by some moderns. Thus Herder speaks of his utterances as the feeble, prolix babbling of a child. In like manner Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Vaihinger, Hahn, Noyes, regard him as a conceited, assuming talker, coming forward with an air of great consequence; supercilious, pretentious; one who advances nothing of importance, and therefore none thinks it worth while to reply. We do not view the person and speeches of Elihu thus. If he be the creation of the older poet, it is highly improbable that the latter would have introduced such a person to spoil the effect of his philosophical poem, and mar its completeness. The grotesque figure would not only be superfluous, but disturbing, to the earnest tone of the work. The symmetry and seriousness would be injured. He can hardly be the representative of mere worldly philosophy, or purposely depicted as a flippant youth who attempts to solve a problem which requires the personal manifestation of God himself to unriddle; because both his ideas and their development bear a striking resemblance to those put into the mouth of Deity. This similarity forbids us to entertain the unworthy sentiments regarding him held by many; or to view his tone and manner as designedly petulant. The speaker is warm and earnest. What he says is good and true. The problem advances towards its solution under his hands. The germ of its right explanation is contained in his words. The most inartificial and ill-executed part of his discourses is the long introduction (xxxii. 6-xxxiii. 7), which is tedious and

inflated. In skill and manner it is much inferior to any part of the older poem.

It is worthy of remark that the genealogy of Elihu is described in a different way from that of the three friends. Indeed nothing but a patronymic is applied to each; while Elihu's father is mentioned, his father's country, and kindred. He was the son of Barachel the Buzite. The gentile noun Buzite comes from *Buz*, the appellation of a small race and region eastward of Palestine. Strange to say, the absurdity of deriving "Buz" from "in Uz," that is, born there, has been gravely proposed. He was of the kindred of Ram, probably Aram, a Nahorite race. But why this minute specification of Elihu? Is it that the poet wishes it to be known that Elihu was the author of the work, after the manner of Oriental poets who introduce the author's name towards the close in some concealed way? So Lightfoot and Rosenmüller conjecture. There is no example of such procedure in Hebrew literature. It is simply the peculiarity of another poet, who shews himself in this and other characteristics *to be another*; else he would have contented himself with giving Elihu's country, as he did in the case of Job and the three friends. Elihu is a fictitious, not a real person.

IX. WHAT IS THE PROBLEM OF THE BOOK?—This question has been variously answered.

1. Baumgarten-Crusius thinks, that the idea of true wisdom is set forth. The different stages of such wisdom are represented by Job, the three friends, and Elihu; simple piety, a legal mind, a conscious and wise religion.¹ Here a legal mind should come first according to the natural order; and the discourse of Jehovah is left out of account. The entire hypothesis is arbitrary and far-fetched, shewing no perception of the purport of the poem. It has therefore remained peculiar to the proposer.

2. Some think that the work was designed to teach the immortality of the soul. Such was in substance the opinion of Michaelis,² who supposed the author meant to shew, that the divine righteousness would not be manifested till a future world, after the resurrection, in which rewards and punishments should be bestowed on men according to their piety and godlessness. More recently it has been adopted by Ewald, who tries to shew that it is the fundamental idea.³ He argues that it was necessary that the essence of the book should rest upon the eternal duration of the human spirit; for how could external evil be completely overcome, if the spirit maintains the struggle with

¹ *Opuscula theologica*, p. 174 et seqq.

² *Einleitung in das alte Testament*, vol. i. p. 23 et seqq.

³ *Das Buch Ijob*, p. 10 et seqq. 195 et seqq.

it even to the end, and is not fully conscious that it will not perish even when the last outward good, life itself, is lost? External evil, as such, is not necessarily the consequence and punishment of sin. It does not stand in actual relation to the inward worth of man, but merely excites the spirit to a higher consciousness, whereby it feels its eternal nature, and is led to overcome outward calamity by rising above it. The book of Job has the merit of preparing deeper views of evil and of the soul's immortality, transmitting them as fruitful germs to all futurity. Yet the truth in question appears as a wish and a hope. It remains in the distant background. It was fresh to the poet and new, wrung out from the depths of consciousness by necessity. A settled and firm belief it was not. It had more of the nature of a foreshadowing, longing desire. The few passages in which the idea appears are, xiv. 13-15; xvi. 18, 19; xix. 23, 29.

Schlottmann adopts in part the same opinion as Ewald, but modifies and improves it. He looks upon the certainty of immortality only as a single and subordinate particular in the solution of the theoretical difficulty; and finds the true solution of the problem in the deeper understanding of the Divine Being and his ways expressed by Elihu, and previously strained after by Job in the third series of discourses.¹

This hypothesis seems to us improbable. The very way in which Ewald proposes it, vouches for its rejection. Surely it is unlikely that the poet would make an idea obscurely adduced in two or three places, and which at the best is nothing more than a shadowy apprehension of future existence that floats in the discourses of Job without firm inherence, the centre of the whole work. If it was perfectly new to the writer, he must have felt the necessity of adducing it with greater prominence, that it might pervade the minds of the pious and reflecting. The epilogue is contrary to such an explanation, because the solution of the problem is given there in the shape of outward facts. Job is rewarded with the double of what he had lost. According to Ewald, however, he had lost nothing, and should not have been so recompensed. The prologue is also opposed to it; for it is there shewn that the calamities of Job are a *temptation* or *trial* which cannot be lasting. But they are real calamities, as well as internal evil. The discourses of the three friends also do not presuppose the sufferer insensible to ill because it has no actual relation to his immortal nature. The speeches of Elihu are adverse to the hypothesis. In short, the idea of the soul's immortality occupies too subordinate and shadowy a place in

¹ Das Buch Hiob, u. s. w. Einleitung, p. 48, et seqq.

the work to be taken as the centre of the problem discussed. Had it been proposed as a clear, definite, unmistakeable matter of faith in the speeches of Job, or in the prologue and epilogue, we should assent to the view in question; but an evanescent longing for immortality uttered in a very few places, can hardly be converted into so much importance. The leading idea of the work cannot be that of immortality, else it would appear in stronger colours and broader outline.¹

3. Others think that the book has a national reference. The nation suffering, afflicted, or captive is portrayed in the pious Job, and directed to a better faith in God as a righteous Governor who does not forsake His people. Some think that the friends of Job symbolise the *prophets* with their admonitions, who are afterwards blamed for having spoken amiss. Among such as adopt this national aspect of the book there is considerable difference of detail. Thus Warburton, who carries out the allegorical interpretation farther than others, understands by the three friends Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem; and by Job's wife, the idolatrous women with whom the Jews had contracted marriages.²

The problem proposed in the book is of wider and deeper import than a nation's changing experiences, else it loses both its importance and difficulty. Nations are always punished for wrong-doing in the present world. Theirs is a visible and marked calamity. Their retribution takes place here. But it is otherwise with individuals. Good men are afflicted in the world. Bad men prosper and prevail. Retribution in their case may not *appear*. The difficulty of the problem lies mainly in vindicating the divine righteousness along with personal integrity. If persons who give undeniable evidence of upright motives and steady principle suffer in the world, how can God be just and wise to allow it? The suffering nation could have received no comfort from any solution of the problem contained in the work. Unqualified submission to the divine will could hardly soothe its sorrows. To be told that it should bow submissively to its fate were poor consolation. The problem must therefore concern the fate of individuals. The book cannot have been intended to symbolise the nation generally in any of the characters introduced; nor to support it amid its calamities by a better hope. The people were not in captivity at the time. They were not then grievously oppressed. They had forsaken God, and were gradually tending towards decay. What would have been appropriate to them, was the stirring voice of some mighty prophet to arouse them from torpor and call them to repentance.

¹ Das Buch Hiob. u. s. w. Einleitung, pp. 49, 50.

² Divine legation of Moses, Book vi. section 2.

The discussion of a philosophico-religious problem could scarcely touch the sluggish body, or bring it to a right sense of sin. Considering the old genuine production, without the speeches of Elihu, what is the problem discussed by the writer? It is this, how the sufferings of the righteous are connected with the providence of a just God. Of course the converse is necessarily touched upon—the consistency of the prosperity of the wicked with the same righteous government.

The Jewish mind must have had great difficulty in resolving a problem of this nature, because the religion of Moses presented nothing else than temporal rewards and punishments. The beginnings of speculation respecting it are seen in the psalms; especially in the thirty-seventh, forty-ninth, and seventy-third. In these odes the writers come to the conclusion that both the prosperity of the wicked and the misfortune of the pious are temporary. The former does not continue; and the pious will be at last restored to honour by God. Their posterity also will inherit the curse or blessing of the two classes. Traces of a deeper solution appear in expressions which indicate a conviction of the vanity of mere earthly prosperity, and of real abiding happiness being found only in communion with God, accompanied by faint forebodings of such happiness surviving death itself and enduring for ever.

In Job the question takes a more comprehensive range, rising to the consideration of the moral government of the world, or how far the wisdom and justice of God appear to pervade the arrangements of the present system. This is a new attempt of the same theological speculation, which the progressive experiences of individuals as well as of the whole nation contributed to produce. The increasing embarrassments of life and the fate of the nation ever becoming darker stirred the foundations of faith more deeply, and induced a higher reflectiveness. The mind was thus strengthened for deeper exercises. Speculation was impelled to make new attempts, and the development of the inner nature was promoted.¹

If these observations be just, it is superfluous to point out the absurdity of making the problem of the book to be, Does Job serve God for nought, *i.e.*, is Job's virtue unselfish? There is no problem in debate between God and Satan. The poet did not cast his work in such a mould. Equally absurd is it to say that there is a problem between Job and his friends, as well as one between God and Satan; the former being, What is the explanation of Job's sufferings? a question minor to the great problem and different from it. All such distinctions shew misapprehension of the work.

¹ See Hupfeld, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft*, 1850, Nos. 35-37.

The design of the writer was to demonstrate the insufficiency of the current doctrine of compensation. Like previous psalm-writers, he wished to purify and deepen the popular faith. The old law was pervaded by the doctrine of strict retribution. It held forth the invariable connection between virtue and prosperity, guilt and suffering. Blessings in this life were associated with its fulfilment; with its neglect or violation, calamities. Divine justice was seen *on earth*, punishing the wicked outwardly, and rewarding the good. As a man lives, so he fares in the world—that was the genius of Mosaism. Experience, however, is often at variance with this doctrine. We see the godly suffering the blasts and blight of adversity, while the wicked flourish and prosper. The world presents examples, both of high-minded men living upright lives and oppressed with misfortune, and of successful villains. Here the popular Hebrew faith was contradicted by appearances. The divine retribution held out was violated. The mind of the poet-philosopher, powerfully affected by the sufferings of the pious, could find no comfort in this doctrine. As he brooded over it, it seemed jejune and cheerless. He tried therefore to get beyond it into a region where all might not be dark, but some ray of hope perchance might dawn, and God appear other than unjust. He felt that the prevailing opinion respecting God's justice in the prosperity and adversity of his creatures was not well-founded. The wicked oft succeed; the good often suffer. The force of experience, internal and external, pressed upon his reason. There must therefore be a better way of judging about the distribution of good and evil than the old established one. There must be a deeper and more comprehensive view of the ways of providence towards men. On the one hand, the justice of God must be maintained. Whatever takes place under His rule must be right. On the other, the lives of the suffering pious cannot be overlooked. How is the Deity just in allowing them to be oppressed with misfortune? What then is the solution which the writer attains to? How far does his struggling mind reach? Does he get at nothing more than the untenableness of Mosaism; or does he arrive at an adequate solution of the problem?

No *adequate* solution can be furnished on the ground of the Jewish economy. It is only by the gospel of Jesus Christ that a certainty of righteous compensation after death is unfolded. *There* is the Christian's comfort. *There* the ways of God toward man are fully vindicated. Life and immortality are brought to light by Christianity alone. We need not, therefore, expect a satisfactory solution from the author of the book. All that can be reasonably looked for is some approach to it—something.

beyond this current Mosaism where all is mystery and darkness. The prevailing doctrine of strict retribution in the present life is shadowed forth in the discourses of the three friends. Among the Jewish people it was usually held as *they* enunciate it. They represent the current faith of the nation, viz., that the good and bad which befall mankind in this life are regulated by their conduct. If therefore the righteous are visited with adversity, they must have committed such sins as bring upon them retributive justice. Yet this faith, though the current one, should scarcely be identified with the true theocratic doctrine. It cannot be said that they give it exactly according to the law. Indeed it could not be so propounded in a course of reasoning upon it. Whenever one begins to discuss the doctrine and deduce its consequences, he recedes from the simple statement of it in the law of Moses. They rightly infer that outward sufferings are always a punishment for sins committed. It is a wrong deduction on their part that sin is always punished with a degree of outward intensity proportioned to its greatness. We admit that such a conclusion is natural, though it be not legitimate.

The gifted writer sets forth the current doctrine very strikingly. He reasons upon and expands it. He urges it in all its nakedness. How comfortless it is, the speeches of Job shew. It is revolting to man's higher consciousness. Both the pure heart feeling that it has uniformly aimed at the highest good, and the clear understanding in the sincerity of its convictions, rebel against it. The higher and more conscientious the motives, the less are they satisfied with it. To an imperfect state of civilization, when men's desires are sensuous, Mosaism seems well adapted, because it appeals to the lower nature. But when advanced civilization, intelligence, spirituality, noble aims, and upright conduct prevail, a conflict with it arises.

A better doctrine is put into the mouth of Job, who shews that divine justice cannot be vindicated on the ground of outward prosperity or adversity exclusively. External calamities, he argues, are not the proper test of sins committed. His utterances set forth the struggles of a mind like that of the writer emerging out of the old doctrine. Both experience and consciousness testify that there is often opposition between men's condition and merits; that their lot in life is so unequal as to impugn the universality of earthly retribution. The doubts are strongly expressed, often irreverently, always naturally; because a spirit wrung with unutterable anguish gives vent to its feelings in words unqualified and unstudied. Sometimes the speaker appears to overstate the case, in conveying the sentiment that the wicked are generally more prosperous than the righteous. In the bitterness of his soul he blames God himself, calling in

question the justice of His moral government because of the integrity of innocent sufferers.

How far then is Job the representative of a better doctrine? He struggles to free his mind from the trammels of national belief, and almost succeeds. But on the whole he attains to nothing more than the doctrine of unlimited acquiescence in the divine counsels and will. No decided opinion is pronounced respecting the ways of Providence, or the causes of prosperity and adversity in the world. Man's duty is to acquiesce in the arrangements of infinite power and wisdom. Doubts of the divine justice should be silenced by the consideration of an omniscient and omnipotent Ruler. Complete submission to the Majesty of heaven is inculcated. Thus the question is not solved. All that is done is to prepare the way for its solution, by reminding feeble man that the counsels of God, though unfathomable, are wise. The hero of the poem is very anxious to penetrate the mystery of divine providence. Nor does the Deity reprove him for so wishing. He reminds him however that it is inscrutable; and in view of such obscurity it is better not to pry too curiously into the matter, but to be still and wait, remembering that the Almighty Jehovah is all-wise, that He does not give to man an account of His doings, but expects an immediate and unconditional surrender on the part of His creatures. The epilogue of *itself* would shew that the poet was not able to get beyond the doctrine of strict retribution which he endeavoured to combat in the discussion: but the prologue indicates a glimpse of sufferings being something else than retributive in the world—viz., permitted for the trial and strengthening of faith. And there are two passages in the speeches of Job which carry the problem a little farther by *intimating* a state of conscious existence beyond the grave. The germ of the doctrine of immortality lies in them. The writer catches glimpses of it. In the earnest longings of his mind he gives utterance to the dim perception of immortal life—the anticipation of a future existence in which he should not be separated from God. But these were moments of high inspiration that did not continue. They were the dawning of a better doctrine on his spirit. As an incipient evangelism they lifted the poet above his age and nation, transporting him within the very shadow of Christianity. Thus amid the conflict of the old retribution-doctrine and Hebrew philosophy, the poet had almost got out of the former. He could not resist struggling against it, till he took refuge at last in the idea of Almighty wisdom, where lies the undeveloped germ of the doctrine of immortality. The new faith triumphed in part over the old; for Job silenced his opponents. In the fierce conflict between them, the popular

belief lost ground; although the writer could not rise to a clear belief of immortality. Thus the question is so far cleared up under the religious ethics of the minstrel-philosopher as to prevent despair and to silence murmuring at the inequalities of the divine dispensations. The suffering righteous are not left without comfort. Though the design of afflictions in the case of the upright be not known, they should lead to the entire submission of the heart to Jehovah—to a perfect faith in the wisdom, as well as the justice, of the most High. It is a marvellous advance on the part of the gifted poet into the domain of religious knowledge to shew that piety may be *disinterested*. It is true, that this is not presented in the purest form; yet it does appear in the example of Job. The virtuous spirit can arrive at no ulterior point even under the New Testament. In this respect the writer tends toward that exalted Christianity so beautifully described by John, in which the believer loves God because He is love; not because He has a reward to bestow in a future world. An outward and carnal dispensation could not exhibit such love of God in Christ Jesus: the writer approaches it in setting forth the disinterestedness of Job's piety.

From these remarks it will be seen, that the main result at which the poet arrives is solely a negative one. He shews the problem to be simply insoluble. This, however, is an important advance beyond the Psalms. He transfers it from the region of speculation to that of faith, and puts an end to the discussion for ever by proving it to be both intellectually and morally beyond the grasp of man. But though the result be negative, it is not without a positive element. So far it is practical. A firm adherence to the wisdom and righteousness of God is inculcated. This is the main conclusion of the dialectic poem before us. What points beyond it is not expressly stated. Yet there is a glimmering anticipation of a higher and hidden solution of the mystery outside the circle of man's vision. Not till heaven be opened by Christianity, where mankind may see their Father more nearly, can this faith of submission to the divine arrangements become a satisfying principle which blesses the immortal spirit in communion with Him. Care should be taken not to represent Mosaism and the later doctrine of future judgment as antagonistic *in themselves*. The former had no distinct reference to immortality, and therefore gave occasion to selfish views of religion. It *wanted* what was subsequently revealed. It was an initiatory institution adapted to the Jewish mind in a certain age. Objective and sensuous, it deterred men from evil, and prompted them to good, by earthly considerations. But even in this the later doctrine of Scripture did not *contradict* it. It only advanced farther. Future rewards and punishments were

brought out to view under the new economy: under the Mosaic they were simply *unknown*. The law was silent respecting them: it did not deny that they would be. This silence of the law led to the notion that calamity in the present life was *merely* retributive.

Let us see particularly how the theme is developed. Great skill, with true poetic spirit, is displayed in the manner of its treatment. A prologue introduces the subject to the reader's attention. According to it an eminently pious man is suddenly overtaken by misfortune. Satan has got permission to afflict him. But though he is the immediate author of Job's calamities, the allegorical scene in heaven intimates that God intends a trial of the sufferer's virtue. Notwithstanding the loss of all his property and children, as well as a severe disease affecting his person, and the evil suggestion of his wife, the godly man continues true to the Lord. Three friends come to console him. Their long silence, as they sit regarding him with feelings of pity, irritates his spirit. He breaks the silence in language of impassioned complaint, cursing the day of his birth. Here is an indirect accusation of the divine justice in the government of the world, provoking the friends to reply to his irreverent words. A discussion commences between him and the speakers respecting the cause of the sufferings endured by the righteous. The argument is conducted in the form of a dialogue or controversy. The substance of what the three allege is, that misery always presupposes guilt—that every one who is punished in this life is punished for his sins—and that therefore he is suffering the just consequence of great crime. They look upon the outward state of men as the index and evidence of the favour or displeasure of God. Hence they exhort Job to repent of his guilt.

The reply of the sufferer is that he is upright, and is therefore hardly dealt with by God who afflicts both the righteous and wicked. Confident of the justice of his cause he avows his hope and conviction that Jehovah will hereafter appear as the vindicator of his innocence; and reproaches the friends with advancing unjust charges against him to ingratiate themselves with the Almighty.

The interest of the narrative increases as the speakers become warmer and more impetuous. At first they are cautious in their assertions; but are gradually less guarded. Their statements become wider and more sweeping. Thus at the commencement the three merely insinuate that Job's afflictions must have been caused by great sins: by and bye they openly charge him with secret crimes. Speaking with greater asperity they repeat their charges of impiety against Job more strongly. In the same

manner, the sufferer's defence, mild and moderate at first, becomes more vehement. He asserts his innocence with greater confidence, denies the frequency of the divine judgments on wicked men, and maintains that if God himself were to erect a tribunal he would be acquitted there. With consummate ability the same sentiments, differently expressed according to the age and character of the three friends, are put into their mouths. Eliphaz, the oldest, takes the lead, speaking with most dignity and importance. Bildad has more sharpness and warmth, but less fullness and skill in arguing. Zophar, the youngest, begins violently, but soon becomes weak and tame.

The language of the parties should not be narrowly scanned as if it were prose. We should also remember its adaptation to the exciting situation of the speakers, who are not always right, though uttering many just and true sentiments. The friends err in supposing that the sufferings of the righteous in this life are invariably the result of crimes on their part. By arguing that sins are always punished and virtue always rewarded with adversity and prosperity respectively, they are open to animadversion. Job is also wrong in maintaining his integrity so strongly as to accuse God of injustice in the moral government of the world. He rebels occasionally against the righteous administration of the Almighty, because he has witnessed the frequent prosperity of the wicked, and is unable to see in his own case why the Deity should grievously smite. Though he has the advantage of his opponents in the argument, he takes a superficial view of sin, and has an exaggerated idea of his innocence.

The friends are put to silence, so that Zophar ventures to say nothing in the third series of the controversy. Here a new disputant steps forward. Elihu as a young man had waited till Job and his friends had finished speaking. He undertakes to shew that both parties were wrong; the friends in maintaining that greater sufferings imply greater crimes and are always a punishment for sins committed; the former in arguing with the Almighty and calling His justice in question. He adduces some thoughts on the disciplinary nature of calamities. Affliction is intended to correct men by shewing their inherent sinfulness, and leading to the exercise of a simple trust in God, who removes the affliction when it has produced humility. The goodness as well as the justice of the Almighty may be discerned in suffering, when it points the righteous to a higher worldly happiness. All creation shews the power and justice of the Almighty; how then can a man assert that he suffers innocently?

Jehovah now appears and speaks out of the whirlwind, point-

ing out how foolishly Job had questioned the divine justice. The sufferer submits to God, and repents of his sin. He bows in lowliness of spirit before the Divine Majesty. The three friends are reproved for maintaining that there is an invariable connection between external condition and the state of the heart towards God; as well as for their harsh treatment of a friend in distress.

It is very probable that the Israelites did not attach much importance at first to this grand poem. It had no canonical authority when it was written. Rather was it looked upon as an artificial and profane composition. Yet it should not be thence inferred with Renan¹ that great freedom was taken with its text; or that copies were not alike, because each person introduced into them something after his own taste. This is not the right manner of accounting for a number of singularities in the text. The difficulties which are now insurmountable did not spring from early copyists disfiguring the logical sequence of the discourses by their officious meddling. To expect with Renan that if old authorities were now found, they would shew a better text than the present, is vain assumption. In a few cases alone should the higher criticism be applied to the text of the book, which has suffered no more than other sacred poems from the hands of the copyists. Probably it has been less corrupted than most.

The science of the book is exactly in harmony with the genius of the Semitic peoples, who are characterised by the absence of scientific instinct. A severe monotheism shuts up man within the continual thought of his powerlessness, excluding metaphysical speculation and consequently all approach to a refined theology. Accordingly the system of the world presented in the poem is very simple: God the Creator and universal Agent animates all beings with His breath and produces at once all the phenomena of nature. Angels form His court around him, pure and holy; among whom, however, one accuser sometimes appears. Semitic meteorology is conditioned and determined by the same rigid monotheism. The clouds and the space above them are the habitation and special domain of God, who governs everything thence. There are the reservoirs; His arsenals, pavilions. Thence He fetches storms, making them His messengers in dealing out retribution. Thunder is always viewed as a *theophany*, marking the descent of God to earth. The noise of it is His voice. Lightning is His light; and the electric flame the arrows hurled from His hand. In all this there is no trace of

¹ Le livre de Job, pp. lviii.-lxi.

the great idea expressed by *laws of nature*—the basis of modern philosophy. Everything is miracle. Admiration peoples the world with marvels. The character of greatness is attributed to what is inexplicable; and therefore everything whose cause is unknown is a motive for man's humiliation and the divine glory. Even in the monstrous and obscure God is seen. Thus animals shew in some respects the power of Deity better than man, because they are in more direct dependence on Him; while reason and liberty are in partial rebellion. Ignorance is a worship; curiosity an outrage. How different this is from the Aryan characteristics need not be described. Among the primitive Aryans nature was peopled with life. Every element became a divinity. The tendency to polytheism and mythology was involved in this conception of nature; yet a scientific, metaphysical spirit was fostered. Instead of being shut up in the narrow circle of an undeveloped Monotheism they looked into the causes of things. They had an idea of the *laws of nature*.¹

X. JOB XIX. 25-27.—Much has been written on the meaning of this passage. Opinions respecting it may be reduced to three.

1. Some regard it as a noble confession of faith in the Redeemer. This has been held by Pfeiffer, Schultens, Michaelis, Velthusen, Rosenmüller, Drs. Good, Hales and J. P. Smith. Those who do so usually think that the words imply a belief in the resurrection and judgment.

It is not easy to gather together any tangible evidence on behalf of this hypothesis. One thing relied on is the word *Redeemer*, לֹאֵל. The term properly means *blood-avenger* or *kinsman*. It is nowhere else applied to the Messiah, though often used of God as redeeming and delivering Israel from the bondage of Egypt, from the Babylonian exile, etc., Ex. vi. 6; Is. xliii. 1; xlviii. 20, etc. Even granting that the term may be *appropriated* to the Messiah in one place of the New Testament, it does not follow that such is its sense in the Old. It signifies *deliverer* or *vindicator* in the passage before us, meaning the Almighty. The erroneous translation, "at the last [day] he will arise [in judgment] upon dust [mankind]," has contributed to support the same hypothesis. The last *day* is not intimated. Neither is his arising *in judgment* or triumph. Nor does עָפָר *dust* mean *mankind* or the *ruins of mortality*. In like manner, the view has been favoured by the improper version *even from my flesh*, instead of *without flesh*. It is the extreme of perverted interpretation to find *the incarnation* in the passage as well as *the resurrection*. That a Jew could have held

¹ Renan, Le livre de Job, p. lxxviii. et seqq.

the Christian doctrine of the Messiah's incarnation is a singular assertion, betraying total ignorance of the genius of Mosaism and of the Old Testament generally. The patriarchs had no conception of the resurrection of the body. The idea of it was unknown to them. Their faith did not even embrace a belief in the immortality of the soul. Let the passage be tortured as it will, to bring the doctrines of the incarnation and resurrection out of it implies their previous insertion, in the face of reason and hermeneutics.

The passage xiv. 7-12 has also been adduced as a proof that the writer of the book was acquainted with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. "For there is hope of a tree if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease. Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground, yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant. But man dieth and wasteth away: yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: so man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep." The sense here is, not that man should continue in the grave only till the heavens should pass away, and then awake after their dissolution, to a new life; but that he should *never* awake, since everlasting duration is elsewhere attributed to the heavens (Ps. lxxxix. 36, 37; cxlviii. 6; Jer. xxxi. 36). The fate of a tree is said to be better than that of man; which it would *not* be, if the place teaches the resurrection to life.

2. Others think that Job expresses his firm conviction that God will yet appear even in this life as the avenger of his innocence. Though reduced to a mere skeleton, his skin broken to pieces and his flesh disappearing through the consuming influence of disease, he shall yet behold God. Accordingly this expectation is fulfilled. His integrity is vindicated by the appearance of God.

In favour of this view, are alleged the declarations of Job in other places, as vii. 8, 9; x. 20-22; xiv. 7-15; xvii. 11-16, which express no belief in the existence of a future state; the fact that neither Elihu alludes to a future life of retribution as a source of consolation, nor God himself; and that the Jewish commentators in searching for proofs of the doctrine of a future life do not adduce this passage. Of more weight are the objections founded on the language; for עַל-עֶפֶר refers to the *grave* or *sepulchre* elsewhere in the book, xvii. 16; xx. 11; xxi. 26. It is more natural therefore to apply the phrase to the grave than

to the wasting process of disease—to explain it in contrast to the twenty-sixth verse, rather than by xli. 25. In like manner, the words “after my skin,” etc. etc., are more consonant to *deprivation of life* than extreme emaciation.¹

3. We hold that the hope of Job here expressed refers to his seeing God after death as a vindicator of his integrity. The sufferer clings to the belief that even beyond death he should behold the Deity attesting his innocence.

This view agrees best with the words of the passage. Nor is it discordant with anything else in the book. The passages xvii. 13-16; xiv. 13-15; xvi. 18-25 imply no more than that the speaker conceived of himself in the future as in a dark and joyless subterranean abode, the shadow of this present life. Beyond this life there was nothing but an indistinct and shadowy existence. All that can be deduced from them on the part of the speaker was that he had a dim foreboding of future existence, which could afford no consolation to the mind. There was nothing distinct, clear, or definite in the idea; for Sheol was conceived to be a land of shadows. In the passage before us the hope of Job penetrates beyond this limit. Though the general drift of the book may warrant no higher belief than what is expressed in other places, it is not *opposed to a higher*. It may occur in a solitary passage and be prominent there, without being adduced elsewhere; especially as it does not solve the general problem because it is not a future state of *retribution*. The belief expressed is merely that of the soul's separate, conscious existence after death. The hope of Job is therefore represented as piercing through the shades of Sheol, and rising to a belief in life beyond the grave. The soul of the sufferer will live after his body has dissolved in dust. In a moment of unusual inspiration the poet brings forth this precious thought, which soon disappears again. The idea was an extempore flight of faith, which had no influence in resolving the problem discussed in the book; for the issue of the whole is that Job sees God on this side the grave and receives an attestation of his integrity. As a reward of his faith the Deity comes down to him in love before his dying, to declare his innocence of the crimes laid to his charge. Thus the solution does not advance beyond the point contained in the Pentateuch.

From these remarks it will be seen, that while we reject the *Messianic* exposition of the passage involving the doctrine of resurrection and general judgment, we also reject the view which finds nothing more than a firm assurance of God's future

¹ See Noyes on the book of Job, p. 144 et seqq., second edition.

vindication of Job's integrity from the unjust accusations of his friends before he died. It appears more natural to regard the passage as expressing an expectation of immortality. The spirit of Job pierces into futurity, beyond Sheol; and confidently hopes for a vision of God interposing to assert his righteousness. At this particular crisis his faith penetrated farther into the future than before. The poet who puts such language into Job's mouth was not aware of the extent of meaning to which a calm thinker might carry out his words: his habitual ideas of a future state were those of his age and nation; as we may infer from the fact, that other passages present the ordinary ideas of Sheol in and considerably after the Solomonic age, and that the noble pearl exposed to view here is seen nowhere else in the book. It was therefore a *momentary* outburst and triumph of faith on the part of the inspired poet; not a settled and serious belief. The doctrine of immortality gleams forth in the passage like a solitary star in the darkness, breaking out at once to the view of the admiring beholder; but only to be hid immediately in surrounding clouds and shadows.

We are glad to be confirmed in our opinion by the authority of Ewald, Vaihinger, Umbreit, Hupfeld, Hoelemann, Koenig, and Delitzsch.

It is very unfortunate that the English version of the paragraph should be so incorrect as to prevent the true sense from being seen. The following is offered as literal and faithful to the original:—

“But I know, my vindicator lives,
And the last, he will arise over the dust;
Yea, after my skin, when this [body] is destroyed,
Even without my flesh shall I see God;
Yea, I shall see him for myself;
Mine eyes shall behold him, none other [shall do so];
My reins pine away [with longing] within me.”

יִיְיָ should not be taken as a noun, of which there is no example elsewhere. It is properly an adjective; and is so used here. We cannot therefore adopt Ewald's *Nachmann*—afterman—a noun in apposition with *Goel*. To suppose any allusion in it to Messiah's *incarnation* is anti-Jewish. The Jews never thought of Messiah as properly divine or God. Their monotheism would have revolted against the idea. Messiah is never presented as God in the Old Testament.

XI. JOB XIV. 13-15.—“Oh that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me! If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed

time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee: thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." The thirteenth verse expresses a wish that Job's abode in the gloomy region of the dead may not be everlasting, but that, delivered from the under world, he may be permitted to return to a new life. Separated from life he seems cut off from God's remembrance. But the first hemistich of the fourteenth verse starts an objection to the possibility of the wish uttered in the thirteenth being fulfilled. He reflects that he is but a man, who when dead cannot be remembered by God. Can he that dies, live? The second member of the fourteenth verse refers immediately to the thirteenth. The wish already uttered breaks forth again, and the speaker thinks of its fulfilment. He says that he will wait all the days of his appointed warfare—his time of abode on earth and in the realms of Hades—till his change come—*i.e.*, till he be relieved from that service below. The fifteenth verse is explanatory of the way in which the change will take place. "Thou shalt call and I will follow thee; thou wilt have a desire after the work of thine own hands;" as if God cannot suffer His own creatures to perish. Thus Job wavers between despair and confidence. Sometimes he is struck with the idea that man is never resuscitated; at other times he thinks that God might recal him to life, and compares himself in Hades to a soldier on duty waiting to be relieved. It is apparent, therefore, that the passage expresses the same hope of immortality as that in xix. 25-27. It does not, however, imply a clear perception of that doctrine. All that is intimated is a groping after it—a passing conception of man's immortality, after release from Hades. The poet shrinks from the thought of an eternal separation from God; and therefore he speaks as if he felt it could not take place. The belief of immortality dawned indistinctly on his mind—or rather it flitted across it with a momentary gleam of light overshadowing, for the time, the conviction of his reason. He had therefore arrived at the very verge of a region where the problem agitating his soul would have been fully solved; yea he crossed the frontier by yielding to the momentary impulse of the divinity that stirred within him. An outburst of his higher nature led him to the dim apprehension of immortal life.¹

XII. JOB xvi. 18, 19.—"O earth, cover not thou my blood, and let my cry have no place. Also now, behold, my witness is in heaven, and my record is on high." Some find in these verses also the hope or anticipation of immortality. The meaning of them appears to be, "May I, if I must die innocent, obtain after

¹ See *Bibliotheca Sacra* for May and August, 1849; article, *Spirituality of the book of Job*.

my death the recognition of my integrity. Even now there is a silent witness in heaven perfectly conscious of my innocence." Job expects to be justified by God, who knows his integrity. Does he expect it in the present life? So we infer from the twenty-second verse. He looks for it *soon*, even before his approaching end, believing that he may live to see the testimony of God on his behalf. It was not necessary that the acquittal should be delayed till after his death. He hopes that his wish may be antecedently fulfilled. If this interpretation be correct, the passage expresses no hope of immortality on the part of the speaker.

XIII. JOB XXII. 15-20.—Among the many sentiments incor- rectly found in the book of Job is a reference to the former destruction of the world by water and to its final dissolution by fire, said to have been prophesied by Enoch before the deluge, and to have been known to Noah, who transmitted it to his family; and therefore it was subsequently communicated to Job and his friends. In the last speech of Eliphaz we find the following (xxii. 15-20):—

/

Wilt thou hold fast the old way
Which wicked men have trodden,
Who were cast in chains before the time,
Whose firm foundation became a flowing stream,
Who said unto God "depart from us,"
And what can the Almighty do for them?
Yet he filled their houses with blessing.
(May the counsel of the wicked be far from me.)
The righteous shall see it and rejoice,
The innocent shall laugh them to scorn.
"Truly our adversaries are destroyed,
The fire has consumed what they left."

Here Job is warned, lest in his sinful obstinacy he should be like the sinners of the old world who suffered premature destruction. The expression *a flowing stream* may perhaps refer to the flood, but more probably to Sodom and Gomorrah, who were desolated by a fiery flood. The language of the impious people is given in the words used before by Job. The righteous, it is said, will rejoice at the fate of such as follow the path of the old sinners; and their speech is given, in which they triumph over the fall of the wicked. Hales unwarrantably supplies *Noah* to *innocent* (the innocent Noah derided them), and brings forth the far-fetched, false meaning, as if Noah had said, Though this judgment by water, however universal, may not so thoroughly purge the earth as that iniquity shall not spring up again and wicked men abound, yet know that a final judgment by fire will utterly consume the remnant of

such sinners as shall then be found alive, along with the earth itself!!¹

The fire refers to the manner in which some of Job's possessions were destroyed, and denotes the fiery stream that overwhelmed the cities of the plain. *The remnant* of sinners is a thing unknown to the passage, the word denoting *possessions, what is left*.

XIV. VIEWS GIVEN OF SATAN AND ANGELS.—The view given of *Satan* in the book is peculiar. He is not certainly a sociable spirit, one of the sons of God with whom the Almighty holds gracious discourse; as Herder, Ilgen, and Eichhorn suppose. He is both evil and suspicious, the accuser and tempter of man. Yet he appears in the assembly of the angels in heaven. The Almighty addresses and interrogates him there. He receives permission to torment Job to a certain extent. There is no impassable gulf between good and bad spirits. The kingdom of Satan is not separated from the kingdom of light by an infinite chasm. The great evil spirit is not at the head of an innumerable host of spirits, malevolent like himself, whom he employs as instruments of evil. Ministering spirits do not wait upon him. He is admitted alone into the divine assembly in heaven. He is not an independent sovereign, possessing power of his own; but mingles with a throng of spirits who are represented generally as capable of falling, for we read, "He put no trust in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly" (iv. 18); and again, "He trusts not his holy ones (*i.e.*, the good spirits), and the heavens" etc. (xv. 15). The different spirits and powers are regarded as all serving Jehovah in peace after he has made repose and union among them (xxv. 2). This description of Satan differs from the later development of the national belief respecting him, where he appears at the head of a host of evil spirits completely isolated from the good ones. The one host is inseparably divided from the other; and Satan possesses more independence and power, as well as greater malignity. The good angels are *only* good, incapable of erring. How this separation into two kingdoms came to be made we can only conjecture. There is no internal probability of its being a purely Hebrew development. Rather does it bear the form of Eastern Asiatic influence—of the kingdom of darkness and light among the Persians and others. Ahriman ruled over the wicked Dews as their chief. When the Zoroastrian doctrine spread among the Hebrews, it materially affected their ideas of the angels and Satan. This may have been before the Babylonian captivity. Oriental mythology had not to wait till

¹ See Hales's *Analysis of Chronology*, vol. ii. book i. pp. 111, 112.

then for its influence over Hebrew thought. If it had, Satan would not be described in this work as entering into the assembly of the angels of God, and being like them a servant to execute the divine will. The Jews were not yet anxious to absolve the Deity from the *immediate* production of evil. Hence we read in 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, that *the Lord moved* David against Israel to say, "Go, number Israel and Judah." It is needless to observe, that the conversation with Satan is not paralleled by the address of Micaiah to Ahab (1-Kings xxii. 19-23), in which he states how a lying spirit offered to deceive the prophets of the king. It is not the conversation itself between God and Satan which is singular; that is simply a poetical representation; but it is *the kind of Satan* who appears and acts that excites attention; since he is different from the being so called in later times. In vain does Schlottmann¹ try to shew that there is nothing peculiar about the Satan of the prologue, but that he is just the same person as appears in later books; the difference is too perceptible to be explained away. The writer of the poem had conceptions of the evil spirit which do not coincide with those of a subsequent time.

The view given in the book of *angels* is also peculiar in some respects. They are supposed to be a kind of *mediators* who intercede with God that He should listen to the prayers of man. They also interpret the divine will, observing the conduct of men, and pointing out the right path from which they had strayed—the path appointed by God. We infer thus much from v. 1, where we read, "Unto which of the holy ones (angels) canst thou turn." Here it is implied, that angels bear the requests of men before God—that they are *intercessors* for men with Him. The same idea is more plainly expressed in xxxiii. 23, 24, "Then a messenger of God is vouchsafed to him, an interpreter from among a thousand, to declare his conduct to man. Then is God merciful to him and saith, Save him from going down into the pit, I have already received a ransom." Here the picture is that of a sick man wasting away and brought to the gates of death. When in that condition an angel becomes the interpreter of his soul's desires, by bringing the prayer of the sufferer before God and interceding for him. God is then merciful to him and says, "Save him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom in the sufferer's confession of guilt; so that I shall no more allow him to be afflicted for his sin's sake." Thus the angels are a sort of *mediators* between man and Jehovah—intercessors with Him on behalf of his accountable and sinful creatures. At a later

¹ Das Buch Hieb, Einleitung, p. 38 et seqq.

period, as we see from the Apocrypha and New Testament, a *guardian* angel was assigned to individuals and nations. It is easy to perceive how such an one would arise out of the doctrine here faintly set forth. A guardian angel is not meant in Job; neither מַלְאָךְ nor מַלְאֲכֵי justifying that idea.

XV. INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE BOOK OPPOSED TO PLENARY INSPIRATION.—The book before us presents a great stumbling-block to the advocates of what is termed the *plenary inspiration* of Scripture. Job refers to the phoenix (xxix. 18). He believes in the mythological astronomy of the East in which a celestial dragon is represented ready to spring for the purpose of devouring the sun and moon, which are darkened by that means; and in enchanter or magicians, having the power to make him rise and so produce eclipses:

Let them curse it that curse the day,
Who are able to make the dragon rise up (iii. 8).

Yet he does not escape the Almighty's censure. His three friends are reproved because *they* did not speak what was right; although what they did say is more in accordance with the rest of the Old Testament than Job's sentiments. The apostle Paul quotes an utterance of Eliphaz's with the formula, *for it is written* (1 Cor. iii. 19). Thus the speeches of the three opponents cannot be taken for *the word of God*; nor can Job's sentiments be accepted with unqualified approbation. How then are they to be regarded? If they are to be approved only so far as they have the testimony of God in their favour, or as they agree with the divine authority of Scripture elsewhere, we are thrown back on a criterion within us which the advocates of a mechanical inspiration decry, *i.e.*, *our own reason*. That is the only alternative left; for a *proper* external criterion of the divine cannot be got in this case. Such, however, is the very standard they wish for, and which alone they adopt. They pretend to go by outward criteria, historical evidences, the analogy of faith, quotations of the Old Testament in the New, etc., and pour contempt on the blind guide (as they call it) within man. Yet they are forced at times to have recourse to reason. Should it be said that it is only *the writer* of the book who was inspired and gave a faithful record of all that Job and his friends uttered, the shift will not avail; because the writer put the speeches into their mouths. He cannot be separated from them as the mere recorder of their utterances; since his inspiration lies in discussing a problem *through them as the speakers*. This is certain from the fact that the sentiments put into the mouth of the

Almighty himself are those of the author's time and abode, as appears from xxxviii. 31, where *loosing the fetters of Orion* is spoken of; the belief of the Semitic East having been that Orion was a huge giant who had rebelled against God and was chained in the heavens. Hence the mode of speaking which sounds so well in the ears of the multitude, *we must either accept the whole Bible or reject the whole*, proves an impossible thing. How far is the book of divine authority and obligation? Is it *all* the word of God? *How much* of it is *the proper divine word*? Reason must decide—what Kant calls *the pure reason*.

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

I. GENERAL TITLE.—The general title of all the Hebrew psalms is תְּהִלִּים, *songs of praise*, because they are occupied with the praises of God. Only a small part of them are so. At the end of the Davidic psalms the general epithet תַּפִּלוֹת, *prayers*, is applied to them (Ps. lxxii. 20). The Rabbins call the collection סֵפֶר תְּהִלִּים or סֵפֶר תְּהִלִּין, *book of hymns*. In the Roman edition of the I.XX., chiefly taken from the Codex Vaticanus, the book is styled ψαλμοί, *psalms*; but in the Cod. Alexandrinus, it is called ψαλτήριον μετ' ᾠδαῖς, *the psalter with odes*. The most suitable title would be מְזוֹמָרִים.

II. DIVISIONS.—The psalter contains 150 poems of unequal length, extending from two verses, like the 117th, to nearly two hundred, like the 119th. It is divided into five books marked by doxologies at the close. The first book, סֵפֶר אֶחָד, comprises Ps. i.-xli., and concludes thus: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting and to everlasting. Amen, and Amen." The second book, סֵפֶר שֵׁנִי, contains Ps. xlii.-lxxii., and ends with the words: "Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things. And blessed be his glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with his glory; Amen, and Amen. The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended." The third book, סֵפֶר שְׁלִישִׁי, embraces lxxiii.-lxxxix., and terminates thus: "Blessed be the Lord for evermore. Amen, and Amen." The fourth book, סֵפֶר רְבִיעִי, includes Ps. xc.-cvi., concluding with the doxology, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, from everlasting to everlasting, and let all the people say, Amen. Praise ye the Lord." The fifth book extends from cvii.-cl., terminating with "Praise ye the Lord."

Hengstenberg and others regard these endings of the books as original parts of the compositions to which they are now appended; a hypothesis to which their nature and form are

opposed. In like manner Horsley regards the close of the second book as a portion of the seventy-second Psalm, and erroneously asserts "the sense is that David the son of Jesse had nothing to pray for or to wish beyond the great things described in this psalm. Nothing can be more animated than this conclusion. Having described the blessings of Messiah's reign, he closes the whole with this magnificent doxology."¹ All this is incorrect. *כָּל* does not mean *consummated* or *completed*; neither is Messiah's reign the subject of the psalm.

The division into five books is of great antiquity, being recognised in the Septuagint. In the canon, however, the psalter was regarded as one book, whence Peter quotes it as *the book of Psalms* (Acts i. 20). In all catalogues of the Old Testament scriptures it is counted as a single book.

Though ancient, this fivefold division is of little use; because it appears to have originated in no principle of classification. It is at least pervaded by none. Probably it was taken from the fivefold division of the Torah, as Epiphanius supposed.² It is difficult to obtain a good classification. The contents are so varied, the transitions so sudden, the changes of feeling and expression so rapid, that the psalms cannot be strictly divided into classes. De Wette arranges them thus:—

1. Hymns in praise of God; (a) as God of nature and man, viii., civ., cxlv. (b) As God of nature and the people, xix., xxix, xxxiii., lrv., xciii., cxxxv., cxxxvi., cxxxix., cxlvii., etc. (c) As national God, xlvii., lx., lxvii., lxxv. (d) As deliverer and helper of Israel, xlvi., xlvii., xlviii., lxxv., lxxvi.; of individuals, xviii., xxx., cxxxviii., etc.

2. National psalms containing allusions to the ancient history of the Israelites, and the relation of the people to Jehovah, lxxviii., cv., cvi., cxiv.

3. Psalms of Zion and the temple, xv., xxiv., lxviii., lxxxi., lxxxvii., cxxxii., cxxxiv., cxxxv.

4. Psalms of the king, ii., xx., xxi., xlv., lxxii., cx.

5. Psalms containing complaints respecting distress and opposition, and supplication for help, (a) personal, as vii., xxii. lv., lvi., cix., etc.; (b) national, xlv., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxx., cxxxvii., etc.; (c) personal and national combined, lxix., lxxvii., cii.; (d) general psalms of complaint, reflections on a wicked world, x., xii., xiv., xxxvi.; (e) didactic psalms on the fate of the pious and ungodly, xxxvii., xlix., lxxiii.; (f) thanksgiving for deliverance from enemies, which also pass over into the first class, xxxiv., xl., etc.

¹ Critical Notes upon the Psalms, note on verse 20 of lxxii.

² De mens. et. pond. cap. 5.

6. Religious and moral psalms, (a) odes to Jehovah, xc., cxxxix.; (b) expressions of religious conviction, hope, confidence, xxiii., xci., cxxi., cxxvii., cxxviii.; (c) expressions of religious experiences, principles, etc., xlii., xliii., ci., cxxxi.; (d) development of religious or moral ideas, i., cxxxiii.; (e) poems containing religious doctrine, xxxii., l.; (f) proverbs in an alphabetical order, cxix.¹

This division is too artificial and minutely complex.

Tholuck divides the psalms, according to their contents, into songs of praise, of thanksgiving, of complaint, and of instruction.²

Perhaps the best and simplest classification is based on the tone of pious feeling expressed. All may thus be put into three divisions.

1. Psalms of praise and thanksgiving, as viii., xviii., xix., xxiii., xxix., etc.

2. Psalms expressing complaint, sadness of spirit, penitence, grief, etc., as iii.-vi., etc.

3. Didactic psalms, as i., xiv., xv., xxxii., xxxvii., etc.

These three kinds are the utterances of different feelings, the joyous, sad, calm.

In the arrangement and division of psalms there is some difference between the Hebrew and the LXX., with the latter of which the Vulgate agrees. The variations are as follows:

HEBREW.		LXX. AND VULGATE.
Psalms ix. and x.....	Psalm ix.	•
„ xi.-cxiii.	„ x.-cxii.	
„ cxiv. and cxv.	„ cxiii.	
„ cxvi.	„ cxiv., cxv.	
„ cxvii.-cxlvi.	„ cxvi.-cxlv.	
„ cxlvii.	„ cxlvi. and cxlvii.	
„ cxlviii.-cl.	„ cxlviii.-cl., cli. (Apocryphal).	

Hebrew MSS. do not divide them alike. Thus the forty-second and forty-third are put together as one in thirty-seven MSS. of Kennicott and nine of De Rossi. This arrangement is rightly adopted by almost all modern critics except Hengstenberg and Keil. There are three strophes in it. In four MSS. of Kennicott and three of De Rossi the first psalm is connected with the second. This view is adopted by Venema. The two are very different in diction, and cannot have come from one author.

The LXX. and Vulgate put together the ninth and tenth.

¹ Commentar. ueber die Psalmen, Einleitung, p. 3. fourth edition.

² Commentar, u. s. w. Einleitung, p. xxv.

This is rightly done. Satisfactory reasons for doing so are well stated by Hupfeld.¹ The two form an alphabetical ode. It is probable that the 117th and 118th were at first one, as Bleek thinks. But we do not agree with him in putting the 113th and 114th together.

If Hebrew MSS. and ancient versions set the example of departing from the present division, critics are justifiable in doing the same when good ground exists for it. Thus the nineteenth should be divided into two parts, consisting of verses 2-7 and 8-15. The contents and other circumstances recommend this view. The second half is of later origin than the first. In like manner Ewald, Sommer, Olshausen, and Bleek separate the twenty-fourth into two distinct compositions, verses 1-6 and 7-10. The agreement of these parts is not very obvious; but sufficient unity may be discovered to prevent one from making them distinct poems. Ewald's reasons are insufficient;² as De Wette and Hupfeld have shewn. Perhaps the twenty-seventh was originally two, 1-6 and 7-14.

Again, the 115th is connected with the 114th in various MSS. as well as in the LXX., Syriac, Vulgate, Arabic; but their contents are different, and therefore they should be kept separate. At the twelfth verse of the 115th psalm a new one begins in five MSS. of Kennicott and twelve of De Rossi. There is no foundation for the separation.

The thirty-second and thirty-third psalms are written as one in eight MSS. of Kennicott and two of De Rossi, but improperly so. Hare, Secker, and Lowth consider the last verse of the thirty-second as belonging to the thirty-third; to which the strophe-structure is adverse.

III. ALPHABETICAL PSALMS.—Various psalms have an alphabetical arrangement, as xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxi., cxii., cxix., cxlv. Each verse usually begins with a letter of the alphabet, till all be gone over, as in Ps. xxv. But in cxi. and cxii. every half verse begins with a different letter, in alphabetical order. Anomalies may be observed in most of these psalms; as in the first, fifth, and eighteenth verses of the twenty-fifth. The arrangement is seldom complete or perfect; some letters being occasionally dropped. Alphabetical strophes occur in the 37th and 119th. In the former each alternate verse follows the alphabetical order; in the latter every paragraph of eight verses does so.

In consequence of the irregularities occurring in most of these odes, many have thought that they should be remedied by conjecture or the help of ancient versions; believing that they

¹ Die Psalmen uebersetzt und ausgelegt, vol. i. p. 168 et seqq.

² Die Psalmen, pp. 18, 19, second edition.

originated in the mistakes of transcribers. This method of criticism is somewhat uncertain. Thus in the twenty-fifth psalm two verses begin with א and none with ב. Hence Cappellus¹ and others, with whom Hupfeld is inclined to agree, would put ב at the commencement of the second verse instead of א. The analogy of the first verse favours this order, as also the emphasis on ב. Others, as Koepler² and Rosenmüller, suppose א to be like the interjections of the Greek tragedians, such as *ὦμοι*, which are not counted a part of the verse. Bengel supposes it a marginal note, which amounts to the same thing. Such conjectures are improbable.

Venema, Ewald, and Hitzig regard א as belonging to the preceding verse, which cannot be correct. The letter ו is also wanting in the twenty-fifth psalm, fifth verse. It is observable that the fifth verse consists of three members, unlike the rest; and therefore varying conjectures have been hazarded, such as that the third member should be ואתן, as Kennicott and De Rossi suppose; or that after the first member ending with באתה, the second has dropped out; in which case the sixth verse would begin with ולמני, as Olshausen and Hupfeld think. ק is wanting at the seventeenth verse; and therefore Venema³ proposes קראה for ראה; which conjecture, though considered the most probable by Dathe,⁴ must be rejected. After the last letter ת there is a ב, which makes up the number twenty-two. Whether the last verse beginning with ב was a later addition, that the psalm might be adapted by it to the whole people, is uncertain. It looks as if it was. We are disinclined to believe that these anomalies arose from a later corruption of the text in all instances. They may have done so in some. In others they were probably occasioned by the carelessness or license of the author himself.

In the thirty-fourth psalm ו is wanting, which Olshausen would restore in the same way as the ו in the last psalm.⁵ But the last verse begins with ב after ת, which makes up the number twenty-two. This is like the twenty-fifth.

In the thirty-seventh psalm ע is wanting, and ז precedes ב as well as follows it. Venema proposes to restore the number thus (verse 28): עוילים לעולם נשמרו which is very probable. The

Critica Sacra, vol. i., p. 122, ed Vogel.

In *Eichhorn's Repertorium der bibl. u. morgenl. Lit.* v. 72.

Commentarius ad psalmos, vol. iii. pp. 158, 159.

Psalmi Latine versi, etc., p. 86, second edition.

Die Psalmen erklärt, p. 156.

conjecture is approved by Lowth, and supported by Hupfeld. It is favoured by the LXX., Vulgate, Arabic, Ethiopic and Symmachus. The text is evidently corrupt, and must be altered. We are convinced by the acute and pertinent arguments of Hupfeld that the reading recommended is the true one.¹ The thirty-ninth verse instead of beginning with מֵ has ו, which should not be reckoned. A few MSS. and several of the ancient versions omit the ו before תִּשְׁוֹעַת; which reading is approved by Hare, Lowth, Horsley, Berlin, Dathe, De Rossi, etc. The authority is not sufficient to justify its adoption, even though it completes the alphabetical arrangement.

In the 145th psalm the verse beginning with נ is wanting. One is supplied by the LXX., Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions, and the lower margin of one of Kennicott's MSS. The MS. in question is recent (fifteenth century) and of no authority. Indeed it is probable that the verse was translated from the Greek and put in the margin by some critic. It runs thus in Hebrew, יְהוָה נֶאֱמָן בְּכָל דְּבָרָיו וְחֵסֶד בְּכָל מַעֲשָׁיו. It can hardly be genuine, since the Chaldee, Aquila, and Theodotion want it. It was not in Jerome's copies, and is marked with an obelus by Origen. A scholium of the Vat. cod. of LXX. marks it as supposititious. It appears to have been taken from the seventeenth verse; with the first hemistich altered for the purpose of completing the alphabetical order.

Why was this arrangement employed? Was it adopted from an idea of easy adaptation to the memory? So Lowth and Michaelis suppose, not very probably. It is the indication of a later period and degenerate taste. A vigorous and lively imagination would not fetter itself with such an artificial contrivance in the rhythm. When the true spirit of poetry sinks, some such substitute is gladly laid hold of. Lowth remarks² that the ideas are unconnected in these psalms. This betokens a decay of the poetic spirit. The ideas themselves are common-place. The conceptions are cold, feeble, flat; and the plain character of the language corresponds. The thirty-seventh psalm, which has the freest alphabetical order, is perhaps the only exception to this judgment, as De Wette observes.³

IV. TITLES.—All the psalms have titles or inscriptions except thirty-four which are called in the Talmud *orphan*-psalms. These are i., ii., x., xxxiii., xliii., lxxi., xci., xciii.-xcvii., xcix., civ.-cvii., exi.-cxix., cxxxv.-cxxxvii., cxlvi.-cl. Great obscurity

¹ Die Psalmen, vol. ii. pp. 262, 263.

² De sacra poesi Hebræorum prælectiones, xxii. p. 233, ed. Oxon, 1821.

³ Commentar ueber die Psalmen, Einleitung, p. 58, fourth edition.

attaches to the titles. They are of various import, referring to the poems themselves, and are sometimes accompanied by the name of the author and the historical occasion of the composition. Sometimes again they consist of the author's name only. Others are musical or liturgical notes. Let us endeavour to explain them.

מִזְמוֹר *mizmor*, song or poem, with a musical accompaniment. This term is prefixed to many, but seldom by itself, as it is in xcvi. In c. it is joined with **לְתוֹדָה** for thanks or praise; in xcii. it is joined with **שִׁיר לַיּוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת** a song for the Sabbath day. The word corresponds to *ψαλμός* in the Greek version; and is derived from **זָמַר** a verb expressing the clang of chords, of the harp, etc.

שִׁיר *shir*, song, ode, occasionally joined to the preceding.

שִׁיר יְרֵדוֹת, song of loveliness, i.e., a lovely song; or rather a song of the beloved ones—viz., brides; a bridal song. The subject of the psalm relates to love. It is erotic.

שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת (Pss. cxx.-cxxxiv.), translated in the authorised version, a song of degrees. In cxxi. it is **לְמַעֲלוֹת**. What is the meaning of this phrase? The LXX. render it *ὠδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν*; and the Vulgate, *canticum graduum*. If this version refer to the opinion of the Jews that the psalms in question were sung on the fifteen steps which led to the women's court in the temple, it is incorrect. Others think that they were *pilgrim songs* chanted by the Jews as they journeyed to the yearly feasts at Jerusalem; songs of *ascents* or *goings up*, as the people were said to go up to Jerusalem. Some suppose that the contents of several do not agree with this sense, as the 126th, which refers to the return from captivity. Hence Dathe and others who adopt this view, conjecture that some having been previously written were accommodated to the circumstances of the times at a period long subsequent to that of their original composition. The occurrence of Chaldaisms and of the particle **שֵׁ** which does not once appear in the first 121 psalms, though used ten times in the songs of degrees, seem to necessitate some such hypothesis, however improbable. It is not likely that several psalms together were altered and accommodated after the Babylonish captivity. Other critics think that they were songs intended to be sung during the return from exile, which is called an *ascent* by Ezra (**מַעֲלָה**, vii. 9). This does not agree with some of them, as the 122nd, which is a pilgrim-song.

According to Gesenius,¹ the word denotes a gradually progressive rhythm of thought peculiar to these psalms; a phrase or clause in one sentence being repeated in the next with an addition, forming a climax or progression both in the ideas and terms, as—

1. I lift up mine eyes to the hills
From whence cometh my help.
2. My help cometh from the Lord,
The creator of heaven and earth.
3. He will not suffer thy foot to be moved;
Thy Keeper slumbers not.
4. Behold neither slumbers nor sleeps
The Keeper of Israel.
5. Jehovah is thy Keeper;
Jehovah thy shade is on thy right hand.
7. Jehovah keeps thee from all ill,
Keeps thy soul.
8. Jehovah keeps thine outgoing and incoming
From henceforth even for ever.

But the examples of this peculiarity are confined almost exclusively to one or two psalms of degrees. It is also doubtful whether it would be described by the word *מעלות*. Yet Delitzsch adopts the opinion. Hengstenberg has an ingenious hypothesis by means of which he preserves the genuineness of the titles and the old explanation of *pilgrim songs*. Since four of the fifteen are ascribed to David and one to Solomon, he supposes that these were sung by the people as they went up to Jerusalem to the yearly feasts, and were made the basis of a series or system designed by an inspired writer for the same use after the restoration. This author added ten psalms of his own to the old ones, in a studied and artificial manner. The one by Solomon stands in the centre of the system, dividing it into two equal parts of seven psalms, in each of which we find two of David and five anonymous or new ones.² This hypothesis is far-fetched and unnatural.

The most probable of the preceding opinions is that which supposes them pilgrim-songs. The contents of nearly all agree best with this view; and it is confirmed by the plural *המעלות*. The 126th is adduced as an objection; but it is hardly a valid one, because it proceeds out of the times subsequent to the return from captivity, when that great event is referred to for the pur-

¹ Commentar ueber d. Jesaia, xvii. 13, xxvi. 1.

² Commentary on the psalms, translated, etc. etc., vol. iii. p. 410.

pose of quickening and reanimating the hopes of the exiles now desponding in view of their poor condition so contrary to their high expectations. The mode in which the exiles returned is alluded to in *subordination* to the state they found themselves in after that occurrence.¹

מִכְתָּם *michtam*. This inscription occurs in Ps. xvi., lvi., lx. It has been derived from **כָּתָם** *gold*, i.e., of peculiar beauty; or written in golden characters, like the *Moallakat* of the Arabians. The noun **כָּתָם** however, is only a poetical appellation of gold; and there is nothing pre-eminent in these psalms to entitle them to such a distinction. Others interpret *sculptured* or *engraved* as on a monumental tablet. Hence the LXX. render *στηλογραφία* or *εἰς στηλογραφίαν*; and the Vulgate, *tituli inscriptio, in tituli inscriptionem*. Nothing in their contents appears to determine them for such a use. Others, as Gesenius and De Wette, explain the word simply as *a writing*, equivalent to **מִכְתָּב** by interchange of **ב** and **מ**. This yields a suitable sense. Hengstenberg and Olshausen object that **כָּתָם** and **כְּתָב** are independent roots which never pass into one another. Others derive it from **כָּתַם** *to hide*, intimating either that the psalms to which it is prefixed were written by David in exile; or, as Hengstenberg supposes, *a mystery* or *secret*, indicating the depth of doctrinal and spiritual import in these compositions. This is a modern refinement. The root is **כָּתַם**, whose primary meaning appears to be *to stain*, hence *to make a mark, stamp* or *impress*—cognate to but not identical with

שִׁבְלֵי *poem*. This word occurs in the titles of Ps. xxxii., xlii., xliv., xlv., lii.–lv., lxxiv., lxxviii., lxxxviii., lxxxix., cxlii. It appears once in the text, xlvii. 8. The LXX. translate it *συνέσεως*, or *εἰς σύνεσιν* (*συνετώς*, xlvii. 8); the Vulgate, *intellectus* (*intelligentiæ*), or *ad intellectum* (*sapienter*, xlvii. 8). Gesenius explains it a *didactic poem*, from **שָׁבַל** *to understand*, the specific word being afterwards transferred to other kinds of odes. Ewald understands a *skilful, melodious poem*, equivalent to *fine, ingenious, finished*. Probably the noun originally meaning a *didactic* composition became a general term for *poem*; as the Arabic **شعر** properly stands for *intelligentia*, but afterwards became equivalent to *poesis*.² Poets were the *sages* of the old world. This idea is sanctioned by Gesenius, De Wette, and Hupfeld.

הַמְלִיךָ appears in xvii., lxxxvi., with the name of the writer;

¹ Hupfeld, *Die Psalmen*, vol. iv. p. 250.

² Comp. Freytag, *Lexicon Arab.*, vol. ii. p. 427.

and without it in xc. cxlii. It means *prayer*—poem addressed to the Deity. In the 142nd it stands in apposition with מְשִׁיבִיל.

הַהֵלֶל song of praise, is prefixed to the 145th. Originally used in the restricted sense of *hymn*, it was afterwards extended to all spiritual songs.

לְהִזְכִּיר is appended to מוֹמֹזֶר לְדָוִד in xxxviii., lxx. The LXX. translate it *eis anámnēsin*; the Vulgate in *rememorationem*. It means *for remembrance*, to recall the remembrance of the speaker to God. Michaelis interprets it *at the offering*, which is founded, as De Wette remarks, on the uncertain signification of הִזְכִּיר *to offer as a sacrifice*. Ewald, however, adopts substantially the view of Michaelis; *to use as a frankincense-offering* (at the offering of frankincense).¹

לְלֶמֶד in the title of the sixtieth Psalm with מִכְתָּם *to teach*. Probably it means, *to be committed to memory* (comp. 2 Sam. i. 8).

שִׁיר חֲנֻכַּת הַבַּיִת psalm xxx., *a song of the dedication of the house*, i.e., the temple. It is not likely that this contains the historical occasion of the psalm. Hence it is supposed to have arisen either from misapplication of the seventh verse, or from an erroneous reference of the eleventh to David's dancing before the ark. We do not approve of De Wette's explanation that the words denote *a melody*; the melody of some poem sung at the dedication of houses, according to which this was to be sung.²

Many titles seem to be of a *musical* or *liturgical* kind, as—

לְמַנְצִח occurring in fifty-five inscriptions, *before* the designation of the poem (lxvi.) or the name of the poet (xi., xiii., xiv., xix.-xxi., xxxi., xxxvi., xl.-xlii., xlv., xlvi., xlvii., xlix., lxiv., lxv., lxviii., lxx., lxxxv., cix., cxxxix., cxl.) joined with historical notices (xviii., li., lii.); or *after* different notices referring to the nature of the psalm, its author, occasion, and object. Some consider the word as a Syriac infinitive *to be sung*. It is rather the participle of נָצַח *to preside over*, used in a musical sense 1 Chron. xv. 21. It means *the superintendent of the musical choir, the head singer*. The prefix ל expresses the giving of the ode over to the chief musician. Olshausen however supposes, that ל denotes authorship, as usual; the author of the musical accompaniment or of the psalms themselves. This is less probable than the ordinary acceptance.

To this term is added עַל גְּגִינָת or בְּגִינֹת (vi., liv., lv., lxxvi.,

¹ Die poetischen Bücher des alten Bundes erklärt, Erster Theil, p. 222.

² Commentar, Einleit., p. 32.

lxi.) meaning, with the music of stringed instruments as an accompaniment. **נְגִינָת** in the singular and the construct state should be pointed as a plural.

The addition **עַל הַשְּׁמִינִית** refers to the time, *on the eighth or octave* (vi., xii.).

To **לְמִנְצָח** is sometimes appended **עַל הַגִּתִּית** (viii., lxxxv., lxxxiv.), the meaning of which is obscure. The LXX. translate *ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν*; and the Vulgate, *pro torcularibus*, both deriving it from *Gath*, a wine-press. Gesenius understands it of a musical instrument invented or used at Gath-Rimmon. Probably it refers to an *air* or *tune* borrowed from the Philistine city of Gath.

Another appendage to the title **לְמִנְצָח** is **עַל מַחֲלַת** (liii. lxxxviii.). The LXX. do not translate it. Some comparing the Ethiopic, find it nearly tantamount to *κithára*, *harp.* So Gesenius. It may denote some kind of musical instrument; but it is impossible to tell what. It cannot be derived from **חָלַל** *to bore*, meaning a flute. We are inclined to understand it of a tune or air. Hengstenberg's interpretation, *upon disease*, as if it were an enigmatical enunciation of the subject, the spiritual malady with which all are infected, is arbitrary and improbable.¹ In the eighty-eighth psalm it is followed by **לְעֲנוּת** *for singing, to be sung.* The two should be closely connected, *to sing after machalath*; as the LXX. and Vulgate join them. Hengstenberg's interpretation *regarding the tribulation*, is wholly inadmissible.²

Another accompaniment of **לְמִנְצָח** is **לִידוּתָן** (xxxix.) or **עַל-יְדוּתָן** (lxii., lxxvii.). Jeduthum was one of David's musicians. It also refers to his descendants who composed a musical choir. Hence the **ל** or **עַל** means *for, to be given over to*, like the **ל** prefixed to **מִנְצָח**. Hengstenberg thinks that it refers to himself in the thirty-ninth psalm, and to his family or descendants in the other two, because the prepositions are different. But they should be taken as synonymous. That the phrase refers to a *melody* or *air*, as Gesenius and Ewald take it, is less probable.

The same title of the head-musician is followed by **עַל הַנְּחִילֹת** (v.) *after flutes, with the accompaniment of flutes*, **עַל** being equivalent to **עַל**. Hupfeld has shewn that flutes may

¹ Commentar ueber die Psalmen, vol. i. p. 274.

² Commentar ueber die Psalmen, vol. i. p. 274.

have been used with other instruments in the worship of God.¹

Along with the title *לְמִנְצַח* we find in one instance *עַל־מוֹת* *לִבְנֵי* (ix.). This expression is very obscure. The LXX. render *ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ υἱοῦ*; and the Vulgate *pro occultis filii*. Jewish interpreters generally take *Ben* to be the name of a prince hostile to Israel; *on the death of Ben*, a triumphal ode. Others take *ben* as an appellative, not a proper name; *on the death of the son*, i.e., David's son; Absalom, or the Messiah. The Chaldee and Kimchi take *בֶּן* equivalent to *בֶּן־יִשְׁרָאֵל*, the same as *אִישׁ־הַבְּנִים* a *go-between*, a *champion*, applied to Goliath in 1 Sam. xvii. 4, 23: *on the death of Goliath*. Others regard the title as the first words or prominent expression of some other poem, to the air of which this psalm was composed; *to the air*, or *after the manner of*. *Die for the son*, or *death of the son*. The former is adopted by Hitzig after various older interpreters; the latter is found in Symmachus and Jerome. Hengstenberg has revived a rejected Rabbinical conceit that *labben* is an anagram of *Nabal*, the name of one of David's enemies, and also an appellative denoting *fool*, in which sense it is frequently applied to the wicked, *on the death of the fool*, i.e., the sinner. This is most arbitrary and unnatural. The authority is considerable for putting *עַל* and *מוֹת* together as one word. Almost all the ancient versions favour it; not only the LXX. and Vulgate, but the Arabic, Ethiopic, Aquila, Theodotion, etc. Several Rabbins and many of Kennicott and De Rossi's MSS. read them, as, one. The analogy of the title of the forty-sixth psalm *עַל־עַלְמוֹת* sanctions this. We prefer therefore to put the two together, and punctuate *עַל־מוֹת*, supplying before it *עַל* and interpreting with Gesenius, *after the manner of maidens*, i.e., with the female voice, *soprano* or *treble* (1 Chron. xv. 20). Forkel interprets *virgin-measures*, like the German *Jungfrauweis* of the *Meistersänger*,² which does not agree with the context of 1 Chron. xv. 20. *לִבְנֵי* must be translated *to Ben*, the Levitical singer spoken of in 1 Chron.

Another accompaniment of *לְמִנְצַח* is *עַל אֵילַת הַשָּׁחַר* (xxii.) *after the hind of the morning*. The phrase denotes the title or principal thing in some poem after the melody and rhythm of which this psalm was composed and intended to be sung. *After the hind of the morning-red*. Hence it denotes *an air*. Others suppose that it relates to the subject of the psalm, the hind

¹ Die Psalmen, vol. i. pp. 68, 69.

² Geschichte der Musik, vol. i. p. 142.

being an emblem of persecuted innocence, and morning, of deliverance from distress. So Hengstenberg understands it. Others think that the hind of the morning is the *rising sun*, to which the Arabian poets give the name *gazelle*.

Another accompaniment of **עַל יוֹנָת אֱלִים רְחִיקִים לְמִנְצָח** (lvi.). The LXX. translate this obscure phrase, *ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγίων μεμακρυσμένον*; the Vulgate, *pro propulo qui a sanctis large factus est*. The words seem to be the commencement of some other ode or poem to the air of which this psalm was to be set; *after or according to, dove of the distant terebinths*, **אֱלִים** being pointed as a plural **אֱלִים**. Hengstenberg, as usual, explains it enigmatically, *concerning a mute dove of distant ones*, the dove being an emblem of suffering innocence, the second word meaning dumbness, uncomplaining submission; and *the distant ones* the Philistines. Thus it describes David an innocent sufferer among strangers (comp. 1 Sam. xxi.). We reject such Rabbinical conceits.

To **עַל שִׁשְׁנִים מִנְצָח** (xlv., lxix., lxxx.), or **עַל שִׁשְׁן** (lx.). Perhaps the one noun is the plural of the other. Gesenius and De Wette think that it means an instrument shaped like a lily, perhaps a kind of cymbal. It is better, however, to consider it a designation of the *tune or air* to which the psalm was intended to be sung. Hengstenberg takes it as an enigmatical description of the subject or subjects treated, *lilies* figuratively for *bride* in xlv.; the delightful consolations and deliverances experienced, in lxix., etc. This is a most improbable fancy. With the word in the singular (lx.) and the plural (lxxx.) is connected **עֲדוּת**, which Gesenius understands to mean *a revelation*, and hence *a song or psalm revealed*, since the poetic writers of the psalms often appeal to *a revelation*. Others understand, *a lyric song*. The most probable view is that it refers to an air or tune. Hengstenberg supposes that it means *the law*, which is called *the testimony* in 2 Kings xi. 12.

To **לְמִנְצָח אֶל־תִּשְׁחַת** (lvii., lviii., lix., lxxv.), *destroy not*, probably the commencement or title of an unknown poem; to the melody of which these psalms were to be sung. Hengstenberg refers it to the subject of the psalms—a supposition arbitrary and untenable.

שִׁנְיָן (vii.), in Hab. iii. 1, in the plural with **עַל** as if it were an instrument. Deriving it from **שָׁנָה** to wander, some explain a *dithyrambic ode*, wild, enthusiastic; others, as Ewald, a *reeling song*; others, a *song or hymn*, comparing the Syriac to praise; or a *mournful poem*, Arabic **شعبي** to be sad.

Hupfeld compares **הַגִּי'ן** from **הַגָּה** and ingeniously supposes that the one is a secondary form of the other. We explain it of a certain tone or manner after which the psalm was to be sung.

סֶלָה. This term occurs seventy-one times in the thirty-nine psalms, iii., iv., vii., ix., xx., xxi., xxiv., xxxii., xxxix., xlv., xlvii., li., lii., liv., lv., lvii., lix.-lxii., lxvi.-lxviii., lxxv.-lxvii., lxxxi.-lxxxv., lxxxvii.-lxxxix., cxl., cxliii., and three times in Hab. iii. 3, 9, 13, commonly at the end of a short stanza; but in Ps. lv. 20; lvii. 4; Hab. iii. 3, 9, in the middle of a verse, yet at the end of a member of it. It is never found at the beginning but in the progress of a poem; sometimes at the end. All conjectures are erroneous which do not take it as a musical sign.

Gesenius derives it from an unknown root **סֶלָה** equivalent to **שָׁלָה**, the harder **שׁ** having passed into the softer **ס**; and Hengstenberg approves of the etymology. It thus denotes a *pause* or *rest*, a sign directing the singer to pause a little while the instruments played an interlude or symphony. In support of this use and interpretation, the eminent lexicographer refers to the Septuagint which always renders it *διάψαλμα*, i.e., *interlude*, *symphony*, by instrumental music; and to the position it occupies in the psalm, standing as it does in the middle of the poem, at the close of a section or strophe, and serving to divide the poem into strophes. He also appeals to Ps. xix. 17, where **סֶלָה הַגִּי'ן** occurs, meaning *instrumental music*, *pause*, i.e., let the instruments strike up a symphony and the singer pause.

We object to the derivation assigned, because **שָׁלָה** does not pass into **סֶלָה** in earlier or good Hebrew; but only in Aramaean and later Aramaeising writers, like Jeremiah. The letters were therefore not interchangeable at the time when many psalms it occurs in were written. It must be derived from a root beginning with **ס**, not from **סֶלָה** *suspend* the voice, i.e., *rest*, *pause*, but from a substantive **סֶל**, root **סָלַל**, to *ascend*, *lift up*; not the *voice* in response to the instruments, but the musical instruments themselves. The sense assigned by Gesenius does not suit in many places, as Sommer has shewn.¹ It is inapplicable, for example, in lvii. 4.

He sends from heaven and saves me; he whom my persecutor despises (*selah*):
God sends forth his mercy and his truth.

¹ Biblische Abhandlungen. u. s. w. vol. i. p. 1 et seqq.

It is unsuitable in xx. 3, 4.

Remember all thy offerings,
And accept thy burnt sacrifice (*selah*) :
Grant thee according to thine own heart,
And fulfil all thy counsel.

Hengstenberg, in referring the pause to *the sense* rather than to *the singing*, though a pause in the music must intervene where the feeling requires a resting place, does not appear to have considered the position of *Selah* at the end of psalms, where a rest in the sense and music must necessarily take place. As this critic thinks it indicates a pause in the sense, he affirms that the translators who omit it certainly do wrong; a remark as objectionable as many others he indulges in.

Sommer has given a very lengthened investigation of the meaning of the word, and is followed by Keil.¹ His conclusion is, that it denotes the falling in of the priests' trumpets into the psalm-singing and the playing of the stringed instruments by the Levites, expressive of an urgent invocation of Jehovah. Hence it only occurs in certain psalms; and even there in peculiar passages where the poet has given utterance to the warmest aspirations of his heart; to the liveliest feelings and hopes, or the deepest complainings of his soul, before God. This artificial and laboured explanation is very improbable. It is contradicted by facts; for how does it agree with Hab. iii. 2, 3, 5, 6, where there is no invocation of Jehovah? Nor does it suit the end of several psalms, as of the third. The trumpets did not usually accompany the sacred song. Only on particular occasions were they used by the priests. And they would be unsuitable in many passages, as Ps. xxxii. 4, 5 :

For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me ;
My moisture is turned into the drought of summer (*selah*) ;
I acknowledged my sin unto thee, etc.

Ps. lii. 3 :

Thou lovest evil more than good,
And lying rather than to speak righteousness (*selah*) ;
Thou lovest all-devouring words, etc.

Ps. lv. 7, 8 :

Lo then would I wander far off
And remain in the wilderness (*selah*) :
I would hasten my escape from the windy storm, etc.

According to the derivation already given, the word denotes *elevation* or *ascent*, *up*, i.e., *loud*, *clear*. The music which usually accompanied the singing was soft and feeble. In cases where it

¹ In Hävernicks Einleit. vol. iii. p. 123 et seqq.

was to burst in more strongly during the silence of the song, *selah* was the sign. At the end of a verse or strophe where it commonly stands, the music may have readily been strongest and loudest. Perhaps the Greek translation *διάψαλμα*, *interlude*, i.e., of the instruments; where the playing of the instruments alone comes in, preserves a remnant of the true sense. We cannot see any weighty verbal objection to the derivation of *סלה* already given. *ה* paragogic is added to the noun *סלה* like *הנה* in 1 Kings ii. 40; and the stronger sound, in tone, is converted into the weaker *é*, as often happens.

Gesenius, followed by Hengstenberg, appeals to Ps. ix. 16 in confirmation of his view of the word, where it comes after *Higgaion*. But *Higgaion* does not mean *musings*, *reflection*, as is supposed. Neither does it denote *skilful* music; *skilful*, *artistic playing*, in xcii. 4, as Ewald understands. It refers to *noise*; *noisy*, *loud* music. Hence Keil's *piano* is incorrect.¹

V. GENUINENESS OF THE TITLES.—The genuineness of the titles has been disputed by many. Some contend that they are an original part of the compositions to which they are prefixed, and proceeded in consequence from the authors themselves. This was the all but universal opinion of the fathers; Theodore of Mopsuestia being the only known exception. In modern times it has been advocated by Clauss, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Delitzsch, Keil, Alexander. Vogel denied the authenticity of all; and the same view is taken by Bertholdt, De Wette, Hitzig, Ewald, Von Lengerke, Olshausen, Hupfeld.

In favour of the titles it may be alleged—

1. That they are very old. The Seventy found them. In their day the musical notices had already become unintelligible and therefore they sometimes render them in an unintelligible way. The traditions preserving their meaning had been already lost. In answer to this De Wette has remarked, that the remoteness of the translators from Jerusalem, and their separation from the temple-service, prevented them from becoming acquainted with devotional music and similar matters; for which reason they failed to understand the titles.² If this be correct, *distance of place* not of *time* was the cause of their ignorance.

2. It was customary among Oriental poets to prefix their names to their poems. The Arabians did so; and that the Hebrews followed the same practice is supposed to be confirmed by the poems in Exodus xv.; Deut. xxxii., xxxiii.; Judg. v., which contain the names of the writers. It is also favoured by the titles in 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, and Is. xxxviii. 9; 2 Sam. xxii. 1. This argument is hardly conclusive, for in Deuteronomy,

¹ See Keil's *Einleit.* p. 338.

² *Commentar, Einleit.* p. 21.

Exodus, and Judges, the names of the poets are not in proper titles but only in connection with the narratives; while prophets may have designated their utterances by their names, without Hebrew poets generally doing the same. The titles in 2 Sam. and Isaiah proceeded from a later time.

3. All the psalms are not provided with titles; and the existing inscriptions present the greatest variety of form, contents, length, shortness, etc. If later collectors had prefixed them by conjecture, they would not only have put them to many now without any, but would also have given them greater uniformity. In reply to this we affirm, that the great variety of inscriptions is owing to the variety of persons from whom they proceeded. If the collectors had no conjectures to give in relation to the titles of many psalms, why should they prefix any on the basis of the psalms themselves; especially as it is often difficult to derive a probable conclusion respecting the author from the contents.

4. The titles which relate to the character, authors, historical occasion, and immediate design, shew themselves to be original and genuine by the fact that they are often confirmed by the historical books, without being taken from them by mere conjecture; and also that they agree well with the subject-matter; contain nothing demonstrably false; and are only deemed erroneous or unsuitable because of many dogmatic, æsthetical, and critical prepossessions.

It may be admitted that the historical notices in the titles are confirmed by the historical books in some instances, and were independent of them in origin. But in others, we are compelled to believe that they were taken from the Old Testament books themselves; as in Psalm xxxiv. 1 compared with 1 Sam. xxi. 12-15. Here the title is "A psalm of David when he changed his behaviour before Abimelech, who drove him away, and he departed." These words are taken literally from 1 Sam. xxi. 14—from a work written long after David's time. Hence the poet himself did not write them, or any contemporary. Again, the name of the Philistine king is incorrectly given; *Abimelech* instead of *Achish*, shewing that it was from memory. The title is also unsuitable to the contents, which speak of general deliverances from danger, not of a single peril. The psalm is alphabetical, and bears the stamp of a later age. Finally, it is improbable that David would found a psalm on an expedient of doubtful morality. If he did so at a later period of his life, as some argue, he would surely have introduced an expression of sorrow for the means to which he resorted. In answer to some of these considerations Hengstenberg assumes, that David on some occasion in the subsequent part of his history was filled

with lively emotions arising from the recollection of this wonderful escape, and made it the basis of a treasure of edification for the use of the godly in all ages. This is mere conjecture; as is also the same critic's assertion that *Abimelech* was the traditional title of the Philistine kings, as Pharaoh was of the Egyptian ones; *Achish* the personal title. *Abimelech* means *father of a king*, and refers to *hereditary* descent.¹ But hereditary descent is usually indicated by *king's son*, not *king's father*.

Another example of the historical occasion in the title being taken from the Old Testament itself is in Ps. liv. 1 from 1 Sam. xxiii. 19. The verbal coincidence alone shews that the title is unauthentic. The psalm contains nothing individual. It is of general import. And the fifth verse shews, that the enemies from whom the poet was delivered were *strangers or foreigners*, not Hebrews like Saul. The word עֲרִיבִים does not mean *enemies*, *aliens in spirit*, as some translate and even Gesenius endeavours to justify by the analogy of the Latin *hostis* and Greek ξένος. The analogy from Semitic to Indo-Germanic is precarious. Olshausen and others arbitrarily conjecture that the reading is incorrect.

Keil unnecessarily urges against the above reasoning that notices are wanting in some psalms which owed their origin to historical circumstances (xlvi., xlviii., lxxxvii. etc.) or presented copious material for historical conjectures (xx., xliii., lxi.); while they are wanting in other psalms whose contents furnished no ground for them (xxxiv., liv., lvii., lx.).² Uniformity should not be looked for.

We cannot assent to the view that the titles always agree with the contents of the psalms to which they are prefixed. It is true that Hengstenberg and Keil have tried to shew their correspondence, and expended great ingenuity in the attempt. No impartial reader, however, will believe that they have succeeded. Their position is untenable, whatever ability be shewn in proving it. The titles refuse to be cramped within the hypothesis made for them. The authors given, as well as the occasions, are often incorrect. It is easy to say that our denial is based on doctrinal, æsthetical, or critical prepossessions. Such prepossessions may belong to one side as well as the other. No commentator on the Psalms shews more of them than Hengstenberg. Keil and Alexander follow in his wake, twisting anything that appears intractable at first sight into the narrow bed of the hypothesis which boldly maintains the titles to be an original part of the Psalms themselves. Let us give a few examples in proof of our denial.

¹ See Hengstenberg's Commentar, vol. ii. p. 228 et seqq.

² Hävernick's Einleitung, dritter Theil, pp. 139, 140.

The title of the sixtieth psalm we hold to be unsuitable and incorrect. "To the chief musician upon Shushan-eduth, Mich-tam of David to teach; when he strove with Aram-naharaim and with Aram-zobah, when Joab returned, and smote of Edom in the valley of salt twelve thousand." According to this notice, the psalm refers to the history given in 2 Sam. viii. 3-14; 1 Chron. xviii. 3, etc. David carried on war with the Syrians of Nisibis, and conquered them. It was offensive and successful. Surely, however, the commencing verses show a very unprosperous state of affairs. The people had experienced great disasters, and were discomfited. The marks of the divine displeasure were palpable.

O God, thou hast cast us off, thou hast scattered us,
Thou hast been displeased, O turn thyself to us again.
Thou hast made the earth to tremble, thou hast broken it,
Heal the breaches thereof, for it shaketh.
Thou hast shewed thy people hard things,
Thou hast made us to drink the wine of astonishment.

The country was not in so disordered a state at the time of the Syrian war as is here represented. Besides, David already possessed the whole land of Canaan. He could not therefore appeal to the promise of Jehovah, that his people should conquer and possess it.

God hath spoken in his holiness, I will rejoice,
I will divide Shechem and mete out the valley of Succoth.
Gilead is mine and Manassch is mine;
Ephraim also is the strength of mine head,
Judah is my lawgiver;
Moab is my washpot.
Over Edom will I cast out my shoe;
Philistia, triumph thou because of me.

The psalm is much later than David's time.

Take again the fifty-second, whose title runs thus: "To the chief musician, Maschil, a psalm of David, when Doeg the Edomite came and told Saul, and said unto him, David is come to the house of Ahimelech." The contents do not suit this notice, especially the seventh verse.

Lo, this is the man that made not God his strength,
But trusted in the abundance of his riches,
And strengthened himself in his wickedness.

Doeg's riches are doubtful, and had nothing to do with his treachery to David. Nor is it easy to see why David should have thought the conduct of Saul's servant so terrible and dangerous as to call forth the strong language.

Why boastest thou thyself in mischief, O mighty man?
The goodness of God endureth continually.
Thy tongue deviseth mischiefs;
Like a sharp razor, working deceitfully.

The epithet here translated *mighty man* means *tyrant, oppressor*, which is unsuitable to Doeg. To avoid this objection, Hengstenberg arbitrarily and unnaturally applies it and the whole description to Saul. Even the verse quoted respecting *trust in riches* is referred to the king. The critic properly feels that Doeg's history must be decked out with many imaginary traits, if the description in the psalm be suitable. Neither his lying nor deceit is known to us from the Old Testament. He merely reported a fact concerning David to Saul. That David should have described Saul in the language of the psalm is entirely opposed to his conduct towards the king. He had still a respect for the Lord's anointed, and would not have deliberately characterised him thus.

The 144th psalm is assigned to David in the title. This is incorrect for various reasons. As it is closely related to the 18th, one must be copied from the other. The 18th is the original, because the 144th contains other reminiscences. Thus the third verse may be compared with Ps. xxxi. 8 and viii. 5; the fifth not only with xviii. 10, but civ. 32; the ninth with xxxiii. 2, etc. The 18th psalm seems to have been composed when David's perils were past, in his latter days; but the 144th was written in the midst of dangers. The tenth verse speaks of David in the third person, and as *the servant of God*, which David himself would scarcely do. Besides the prefix *W* points to a later age of the Hebrew language than David's time.

In like manner it might be proved that the sixty-first and sixty-ninth, and others bearing the inscription of David, were not written by him. The sixty-ninth belongs to the time of the exile, and was written soon after Cyrus had given the Jews permission to return. The style of it is like Jeremiah's, and probably that prophet wrote it. The seventy-ninth is erroneously assigned to Asaph in the title.

The fifty-first psalm is post-Davidic, as the last two verses prove—"Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offering and whole burnt-offering: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar." It is true that they are but loosely appended to the preceding context, and are therefore considered by many a later addition. That hypothesis is probably groundless. The psalm was written at a time when the city and temple of Jerusalem were thrown down. Both *Zion* and *the walls* of the capital are expressly mentioned. Hence the attempts that have been made to force the meaning into union with David's crime in relation to Bathsheba are unworthy of notice. The poet shews a right sense of sin as committed mainly against God; and a thorough feeling of the

worthlessness of external sacrifices apart from purity of heart or rectitude of motive. Whether views so near the Christian ones were entertained by any Jew as early as David's time is doubtful. A later than David seems to be required by the apprehension of sin as well as the state of Jerusalem, implied in the poem. The beginning of the Babylonish captivity is the most probable date. Venema refers to other cases of psalms being adapted to different times by altering or adding to their contents, as xxv. 22 for liturgical use, and cxxxi. 3; but we cannot think that the last two verses of the fifty-first were a later appendix, even though the sixteenth verse does not seem to agree well with the nineteenth.

From these observations it would appear, that we reject the genuineness and originality of the titles, because they are sometimes at variance with the contents; of which examples have been furnished. Besides the incongruity between titles and the substance of psalms, it should also be noticed that the Septuagint and Syriac versions exhibit the titles with many variations. Thus the Hebrew inscription of Ps. xxvii. is in the Greek, *before being anointed*. From xciii.-xcvii. are furnished by the same version with inscriptions where the Hebrew has none. The alteration of titles by these translators appears to shew that they did not regard them as original or sacred. Surely they would have refrained from meddling with what was genuine. Still farther, one inscription at least has arisen out of various notices put together. The eighty-eighth psalm has a title containing the three synonymous terms *שִׁיר*, *מִזְמֹר*, *מִשְׁכֵּל*; and the author is given, Heman the Ezrahite, in addition to the sons of Korah. Heman did not belong to that family, and thus two opposites are combined. It is also against the authenticity of the inscriptions, that they confine the names of writers to David and several temple-musicians associated with him of whom the Chronicles give notices. Tradition attributed all to one well-known character and his time. Hupfeld also remarks,¹ that the titles specifying the occasions which gave rise to the odes appear in no more than thirteen Davidic ones, and speak of the Psalmist in the third person, in the manner of a later interpreter. We conclude, therefore, that many titles did not proceed from the authors. They were prefixed by later persons according to tradition and conjecture. Sometimes the historical books were used as helps; sometimes their own judgment gave rise to the titles. Sometimes the author and occasion had been determined by tradition. Hence uniform accuracy should not be looked for. It is better to

¹ Die Psalmen, vol. iv. p. 464.

judge for ourselves than to follow them implicitly. Some were found before the collectors of the five books began to put the psalms together. Others were prefixed by the collectors themselves; and others still later.

VI. AUTHORS.—1. David. Seventy-three are assigned to him; viz., iii.-ix., xi.-xxxii., xxxiv.-xli., li.-lxv., lxviii.-lxx., lxxxvi., ci., ciii. cviii.-cx., cxxii., cxxiv., cxxxi., cxxxiii., cxxxviii.-cxlv. Whether all these headings are correct, is a question that can only be determined by a careful examination of each psalm. They are certainly of later origin than the psalms themselves. Yet they were in existence before the Septuagint. And it is hasty to conclude that when nothing exists in the historical information preserved respecting David to furnish occasion to odes bearing titles with his authorship, the alleged authorship should be rejected. Many events may have occurred in his life of which no historical record has survived. The best method of proceeding is to assume the alleged Davidic authorship till internal evidence proves the contrary.

For the better understanding of the psalms ascribed to David, his life has been divided into three parts. (a) His residence in the court of Saul, where hostile courtiers envied and opposed him. One of these enemies is called Cush the Benjamite (vii. 1). To this time have been assigned iv., v., xi., xii., xvii., xxxv., xli., lv., lxiv., etc. (b) His persecution by Saul, when his life was in continual danger; to which time belong vi., xxii., xxx., xxxi., xl., lxvi., etc. (c) The period of his royal dignity, as li., iii., xviii., viii. xix., xx. The advantage of this arrangement is not very obvious, unless most of the seventy-three really belong to David. And even then, it is very difficult to distribute them aright. *Internal evidence* is more to be relied on than a mere heading; though it may be unduly estimated, especially diction and style. How uncertain it is to rely on the titles ascribing seventy-three psalms to David may be seen from the fact that Ewald, resting mainly on the language and contents, attributes to David no more than the following: xi., vii., xxiv., ci., xv., xxix., xix., viii., xxxii., iii., iv., xviii., cx., xx., ii. It is possible to give too little weight to the ascription of authorship in the title, and to rest too much on a kind of internal evidence which is not decisive. Ewald, Hitzig, and some later critics, are perhaps too prone to discard the Davidic authorship. Others who think that we can with certainty deny him the authorship of those psalms only which contain clear references to the captivity, err in the opposite extreme. A nice perception of all internal features, with an ability to estimate evidence at its proper worth, is the best guarantee for a safe conclusion on this point.

Let us take a psalm and examine its authorship. The seventeenth has the heading, "a prayer of David." There is nothing in the contents to shew the particular situation in which the alleged writer was, when he penned it. He was surrounded by wicked enemies, by worldly-minded men who devised his ruin. In this dangerous situation he calls upon God for help and safety. Because we have no means of identifying these enemies, the psalm need not be denied to David. They may have been Saul and his adherents; or enemies on whom he was going to make war; though no political allusion appears. The fifteenth verse has been supposed to furnish a ground against David's authorship; but this implies that the *awaking* mentioned in it means *awaking from death*; an idea which originated in later times than David's. The *awaking* refers to natural sleep—*rising in the morning*—and to nothing else. Hupfeld also alludes to the peculiar use of *חַלֵּד* and *בְּחַיִּים* in the fourteenth verse as possibly pointing to a late period.¹ This is too uncertain to be relied on. The senses of both words are ambiguous. In the absence therefore of any valid argument to the contrary, we refer the seventeenth psalm to David, as the title has it.

Again, the sixteenth psalm, entitled "Michtam of David," has nothing to prevent its Davidic authorship. It is indeed difficult to find the historical occasion of it in his life; but that need not be a stumbling-block in the way. Even Hitzig concedes that it was written by David; and De Wette affirms that there is no decisive reason against that view. Why then should we have recourse with Böttcher² to the hypothesis that it proceeded from a Jew in the time of the exile. The mention of idolatry should not place it there, for idolatry existed in Palestine even in David's time. Nor is the tone of complaint sufficient to associate it with other psalms of later origin. Hence we disapprove of Ewald's denial of the Davidic authorship. Internal evidence does not justify such denial. Rather does it agree well with the heading. The Septuagint version assigns to David eleven others in addition to the seventy-three of the Hebrew text. Some of these are incorrectly given to him.

The variety of the psalms belonging to David shews a mind richly endowed. The royal singer excels in the hymn, the poem, the elegy, the didactic ode. The various situations in which he was placed must have contributed to nourish his poetic genius, storing the mind with illustrations and images drawn from a vast range of observation. The Spirit of God had inspired his capacious heart in a high degree; and its manifold richness was called forth into exercise by scenes and circum-

¹ Vol. i. p. 335.

² Proben alttestamentlicher Schrifterklärung, u. s. w., p. 42.

stances as various as have fallen to the lot of any. He was a many-sided poet, whose harp was full-stringed. Angels of joy and of sorrow swept over its chords as they passed. All varieties of spiritual emotion and experience appear. Great depth and liveliness of sensibility, strong faith of the heroic order, high hope, far-reaching desire, anticipations of future glory and completion, depression and despondency—all the gamut of the spiritual man—are evinced in his writings. The diction too is varied, both difficult and easy, soft, diffuse, tender. The characteristics of his psalms are softness, elegance, pathos, not sublimity. The last quality appears only occasionally, as in the eighteenth and nineteenth. As supplication and complaint occupy a principal place in his compositions, the highest order of poetry can hardly be expected. We do not commonly find the grand, the powerful, the sublime, the soaring; but the plaintive and placid. Single Psalmists may have excelled David in one kind of poetic ability; but none can be compared with him in *general* merit or range of inspiration. "His traits of inspiration," says the poet Campbell, "are lovely and touching rather than daring and astonishing. His voice, as a worshipper, has a penetrating accent of human sensibility, varying from plaintive melancholy to luxuriant gladness, and even rising to ecstatic rapture. In grief *his heart is melted like wax and deep answers to deep*, while the waters of affliction pass over him; or his soul is led to the green pastures by the quiet waters, or his religious confidence pours forth the metaphors of a warrior in rich and exulting succession. '*The Lord is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer, my God, my strength, in whom I will trust, my buckler and the horn of my salvation, and my high tower.*' Some of the sacred writers may excite the imagination more powerfully than David, but none of them appeal more interestingly to the heart. Nor is it in tragic so much as in joyous expression, that I conceive the power of his genius to consist. Its most inspired aspect appears to present itself when he looks abroad upon the universe with the eye of a poet, and with the breast of a glad and grateful worshipper. When he looks up to the starry firmament, his soul assimilates to the splendour and serenity which he contemplates."¹

2. The ninetieth psalm is ascribed to Moses. Whether he was the real author is uncertain; but the language has an antique stamp, that agrees with an old date. Although therefore Rudinger, Grotius, De Wette, Hupfeld, Olshausen, and others, have doubted whether Moses be rightly named as the author, there is not sufficient reason to deny it. The Talmudic

¹ New Monthly Magazine for 1821, vol. i. pp. 386, 387.

writers ascribe to Moses the ten following psalms, *i.e.*, xci.-c., according to a rule of theirs that the anonymous odes belong to the writer specified immediately before them. Jerome and Origen acknowledged this canon, false as it is. The contents of the odes themselves refute it. Thus the ninety-ninth puts Samuel, as well as Moses and Aaron, among the prophets. Hence it was written after Samuel. Hibbard is decidedly wrong in supposing that Moses wrote the ninety-first, which is as late as the captivity at least.¹

3. Two are ascribed to Solomon, the 72nd and 127th. The title of the former probably may mean that the psalm relates to Solomon, not that he is the writer. Certainly Solomon would not have written of himself in such strains. The ascription of the latter to Solomon is incorrect. It is remarkable that it is omitted by the LXX. The title probably arose from the mistaken application of *the house* in the first verse to *the temple*, and *the beloved* in the second verse to Solomon (2 Sam. xii. 25).

4. Twelve are attributed to Asaph, viz., l., lxxiii.-lxxxiii. Asaph was David's chief musician. He was son of Berechiah, a Levite, of the family of Gershon, and bears the title of *seer* in 2 Chron. xxix. 30 (comp. 1 Chron. xv. 17, xvi. 5). Feeling the impossibility of maintaining Asaph's authorship of all the twelve, Hengstenberg and Keil assume that he and the members of his family wrote them. The gift and office of Asaph were thus hereditary. The subterfuge-nature of this view is apparent. Why should his sons not be mentioned, if they wrote some of the twelve, five as Keil thinks; for only seven are allowed to Asaph himself by this critic, viz., l., lxxiii., lxxvii., lxxviii., lxxx.-lxxxii?² The fiftieth may be truly assigned to Asaph. There is nothing against the tradition. The seventy-third was probably his also. The seventy-fourth cannot have been his. The seventy-fifth is later than Asaph's time. The seventy-sixth is also later. The seventy-seventh probably alludes to the Babylonish captivity. The seventy-eighth shews that the writer of it lived after the division of the tribes into two kingdoms (see verses 9, 67, 68). The seventy-ninth is evidently posterior to Asaph; so is the eightieth. The eighty-first refers to a time when the passover was celebrated. It is not therefore David's. The eighty-third belongs to the period of the captivity. Judging by the two (l., lxxiii.) Asaph was a didactic poet of a very high order. The ideas are excellent and the style forcible. Indeed the fiftieth shews that he overleapt external rites as insufficient to constitute true religion, and placed it in the

¹ The Psalms chronologically arranged, part i. sect. 2.

² See Hävernick's *Einleit. dritter Theil*, p. 214.

mind. The sentiments are lofty in tone, evincing the philosopher and poet.

5. Eleven psalms are ascribed to the sons of Korah, viz., xlii., xliii. (forming one) xliv.-xlix., lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., lxxxviii. The sons of Korah were a Levitical family of singers who still continued in that employment in the reign of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx. 19). It is very probable that xlii.-xlix., lxxxiv. were written by the same poet, who did not belong to the time of David or Solomon, but to the Assyrian period. Bleek thinks that he was a Jewish priest living in the reign of Ahaz or Hezekiah. The particulars he adduces in favour of this view commend it to our acceptance.¹ The eighty-fifth is later than the captivity; and the eighty-seventh is of the Chaldean time. It is difficult to conceive of a plurality of authorship unless, as is usually assumed, sometimes one of the sons, sometimes another wrote the psalms in question, without dividing one among several persons. None suits the Davidic period. All are later. Tradition, after assigning to David all that appeared to be his, fixed upon the singers of his time, who were known from the books of Chronicles. To this is owing the fact of the Korahites being selected as authors. It is possible, indeed, that the Korahites may have been nothing more than *the singers*; for the sons of Korah, i.e., *composed for them* and to be performed by them with music in the temple, as Eichhorn imagines. But the analogy of the preposition γ in titles is against this view. Whoever prefixed the headings intended to give the Korahites as *authors*. These eleven are generally speaking exquisite lyrics, characterised by liveliness, rapidity of movement, and high conception.

6. The eighty-ninth psalm is attributed to Ethan the Ezrahite. Who he was is uncertain. In 1 Kings iv. 31 Solomon is said to have been wiser than Ethan the Ezrahite; and in 1 Chron. ii. 6, we read of Ethan as a son of Zerah. All that is known of him is that he was a Levitical singer in the time of David. The subject of the eighty-ninth Psalm is one of David's posterity, a fallen king of his house whom the poet represents as the speaker. The poet wrote immediately before or during the captivity. In the title of the eighty-eighth Heman the Ezrahite appears to be mentioned as the author. The other part of the title gives the sons of Korah. Heman was a descendant of Korah in David's time (1 Chron. vi. 18; xv. 17, 19); so that two discrepant statements are here put together in one heading.

Fifty psalms are anonymous, viz., i., ii., x., xxxiii., xliii., lxvi., lxvii., lxxi., xci.-c., cii., civ.-cvii., cxi.-cxi., cxliii., cxlv.,

¹ Einleitung, pp. 617, 618.

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

cxlvi., cxlviii.-cxxx., cxxxii., cxxxiv.-cxxxvii., cxlvi.-cl. Some of these were written by David, as the third; but the majority are later, belonging either to the declining period of the nation or the captivity.

It is somewhat singular that none of the prophets is named as the author of psalms in the headings. The Septuagint ascribes the 137th to Jeremiah, incorrectly so; because it is apparent that it was written after the captivity, when the recollection of injuries was strong in the mind of the poet, and the feeling of revenge vividly awake. The 138th is assigned in the same version to Haggai and Zechariah. The 146th, 147th, and 148th are ascribed to the same prophets. These are mere conjectures, for which no good reason can be found in the compositions themselves. Hitzig has endeavoured to prove that Isaiah was the author of xlv.-xlviii., and Jeremiah of v., vi., xiv., xxii.-xli., lii.-lv., lxix.-lxxi. We cannot approve of giving such a number to Jeremiah. Hitzig's reasoning in favour of his view is often perverted and arbitrary; as for example in the case of the fifth and sixth. The fourteenth however, is so like to Jeremiah's writing that it may most probably be assigned to him. A few others appear to belong to him (lxxiv., lxxvi., lxxx., lxxxiii.), but not so many as Hitzig supposes. Internal evidence shews that the following belong to the exile-time or after: li., cii., cxxxvii., cxix., cxxiii., cxxiv., cvii., cxi., cxxii., cxxvi., cxlvii., lxxxv., lxxxvii., xci., xcvi.-xcviii., ciii., civ., cxiii., cxvi., cxxv.-cxxx., cxxxv., cxxxvi., cxxxix., cxliv., cxlvi., cxlviii.-cl.

VII. ALLEGED MACCABEAN PSALMS.—Were any psalms written so late as the Maccabean period? This question has greatly divided the opinions of critics. Many hold the affirmative, as Rudinger, Hermann Van der Hardt, Venema, E. G. Bengel, Bertholdt, Paulus, Kaiser, Hitzig, Hesse, Olshausen, Von Lengerke, Herzfeld, De Jong. Gesenius, De Wette, Hengstenberg, Keil, Hassler, Ewald, Bleek, Delitzsch, etc., take the opposite side, and rightly so in our opinion. The extent to which Hitzig has pushed the theory is extravagant; for he holds that from the seventy-third and onward not a single pre-Maccabean psalm occurs in the book. He also puts the first and second into the same category. Olshausen has gone beyond Hitzig in assigning no psalm whatever to the Davidic or Solomonic period, but throwing the most of them into the Maccabean time, even down to the age of John Hyrcanus. This is decidedly erroneous. The canon was completed before then, according to the best evidence we have on the subject. The prologue of the Greek translator of Jesus Sirach's book appears to imply that his grandfather lived at the commencement of the Maccabean time;

yet the law, prophets, and the other books (hagiographa) already existed. And how could Maccabean psalms get into the first, second, and third books of the collection? Incorrect views of the origin of these new psalms could scarcely have obtained such general currency within a few years as to be embodied in the titles.

Besides, the closing doxology of the fourth book appended to the 106th Psalm, compared with 1 Chron. xvi. 36, shews that the whole collection, with the five closing doxologies of the five books, existed prior to the Maccabean time. The psalm in 1 Chron. xvi. 8-36, there attributed to David, was made up of Ps. cv., xcvi., cvi. And as the doxology of cvi. is adopted, it must have been appended before the Chronicle-writer compiled his work, which is tantamount to the assertion that the psalter existed in its present state before the book of Chronicles appeared.¹ When the Chronist wrote (*i.e.*, in the fourth century B.C.) the psalter was reckoned the sacred collection of David's psalms. Hence he took parts of three that appeared suitable for that monarch's hymn of thanksgiving, on the occasion of the ark's being set in the tent prepared for it.

The first book of Maccabees, both in the original and its Greek translation, existed at the end of the second century. And various parts of it shew that the writer had the present psalter before him, and regarded it as David's sacred compositions.²

Again, there is a close agreement of single verses in these alleged Maccabean psalms with various passages in the prophetic writings of an earlier time, especially with Jeremiah and Lamentations, which is against their Maccabean origin. *The same period* gives birth to writings distinguished by relationship, unless it can be shewn that one is an imitation of the other. But the alleged Maccabean compositions bear no marks of being imitated. That lyric poetry indeed should have flourished at the age of the Maccabees has nothing improbable in it. The times were stirring. Religious enthusiasm was kindled, and might pour itself forth in high strains and elevated diction. *The language*, however, would hardly be so pure as that of the Davidic time. The spirit might be equal, as Sirach's example shews; but the diction could not be so free from marks of decay. Neither Hitzig nor Olshausen has succeeded in weakening the force of Hassler's arguments against Maccabean psalms.³ That they are all pertinent and valid we will not say. Delitzsch⁴ has

¹ See Bleek, Studien und Kritiken, p. 371, et seqq.; and Einleitung, p. 619.

² See Ewald, Sechstes Jahrbuch, p. 20 et seqq.

³ See Commentatio critica de Psalmis Maccab. Parts I. and II. 1827 and 1832. 4to.

⁴ Commentar ueber der Psalter, vol. ii. p. 378 et seqq.

argued better against such psalms; and De Jong¹ concedes that only four are demonstrably of so late origin. We believe, however, that the history of the canon is decidedly adverse to the view he holds. That argument at least is apposite.

VIII. COLLECTION, AND DISTRIBUTION INTO FIVE BOOKS.—As to the collection of the psalms, and their distribution into five books, there is no evidence except the internal. Some suppose that it was all done by one person who did not precede Nehemiah. It is conjectured that Ezra was the collector, since he was contemporary with Nehemiah. Those who imagine that the whole was compiled and arranged by one man, try to find one principle running throughout. Similarity of contents and of destination guided the arrangement. The first place was given to the Psalms of David and his contemporaries, Asaph with his choir of singers, Heman and other Korahites—the creators and masters of the lyrical poetry in the Psalms. The compositions of these poets were then distributed into three books, according to the prevailing usage of the two names of Deity. The first book has Psalms of David alone; and the name of Jehovah is predominant in it. The second contains Psalms of David and his contemporaries, the sons of Korah, Asaph, Solomon, and a few unknown poets—the appellation Elohim prevailing in it. The third, containing the Psalms of Asaph and the Korahites, received its position partly from its mixed (Jehovah-Elohistic), and partly from its purely Jehovistic, character. In these three books individual psalms are so arranged as to have some link of union *either* in their internal relation to one another, the similarity of occasions on which they were composed, and the design they were intended to serve, in their common titles, their agreement in ideas and words, their coincidence in certain characteristic images and expressions, *or* in a combination of these particulars. Thus the odes are put together as the links of a chain; two anonymous Jehovistic psalms (x., xxxiii.) being incorporated with the first book; three anonymous Elohim ones (xliii., lxvi., lxxi.) with the second; and a Davidic psalm (lxxxvi.) being inserted among the Korahite poems of the third book. The first and second psalms are placed at the head of the collection, because of their common introductory designation, and their internal relation to one another. The remaining two books are similarly arranged in accordance with the succession of time; so that after Moses's psalm, which as the oldest stands at the head of this collection, comes a decade of anonymous ones reaching from Solomon to the exile; then a series written during the exile and till Ezra;

¹ *Disquisitio de Psalmis* Maacob. 1867.

then the collection of pilgrim-songs (cxxx-cxxxiv.) succeeded by the last group of temple and hallelujah-psalms. In the three last groups are inserted such Davidic psalms as served for patterns to later poets or referred by their contents to the future condition of the kingdom of God in its contest and victories.

Such is Hengstenberg's hypothesis elaborated by Keil.¹ It is very ingenious and complex. Too artificial to be probable, it must be rejected. The canon was not completed by Ezra; nor is there any evidence that he arranged the psalms in their present order. The collection is not pervaded by any one principle. It has no uniformity of plan. David's psalms are not put in the first and second books. They are scattered throughout the whole five. Why is this? Neither Asaph's psalms nor the Korahite ones are all put together. Thus succession of time is not carried out in the arrangement; some of David's coming after Moses's (the ninetieth). The usage of the two names of Deity did not strictly regulate the first three books, because psalms in which Jehovah predominates are in the third book, as well as the first. Compare, for instance, the eighty-sixth psalm. And Jehovah is the prevailing appellation of the ninety-fourth which belongs to the fourth book. Besides, individual psalms are not put together by virtue of any perceptible connexion of subject. Only a few here and there have been so placed; the majority presenting great diversity of subject, style, and time of composition. Thus fifty and fifty-one are wholly different in subject, contents, and style; their juxta-position being explicable only on the ground of contemporaneous origin. The 138th psalm, which is ascribed to David, succeeds the 137th, which is post-exilian. The two are related neither in time nor contents. In short, uniformity of plan is not perceptible as a guiding principle in the arrangement of the five books. Neither time, nor contents, nor name of Deity, could have singly influenced the distribution. Nor could the three together have been the ruling principle; or any two of them. Whichever thing be assumed as determining the collector, it must be checked and counterchecked by other considerations, till it be deprived of its determining power. Hence the idea of one man having arranged the whole must be abandoned, especially the idea of Ezra, to whom some psalms are probably posterior. The hand of a single person is not seen, because no pervading bond of internal connexion can be discovered either in the five books as they now are, or in the individual odes of which they are made up. Some other hypothesis than that of Hengstenberg and Keil must be sought; as theirs cannot be correct. Contra-

¹ Keil's *Einleitung*, p. 343 et seqq.

dicted as it is by an impartial induction of facts, it falls away of itself.

The collection was made *gradually*. The first book was first put together. The collector's design was to give in it nothing but psalms of David. He was not David himself, because it contains several which are much later than his time, as the fourteenth and thirty-first. Besides, as De Wette appositely remarks, David would scarcely have bestowed on himself the honourable epithet of *servant of Jehovah*, which is appended to his name in two of the titles, xviii. and xxxvi. The time when this first book was made must be placed after the captivity, on account of the fourteenth and thirty-first which are as late as that time. This is different from Bleek's opinion who places the making of the first two books *before* the exile, because he thinks that the whole collection was not later than Nehemiah.

The second book was appended to the first, probably by another collector, for while the prevailing use of *Jehovah* characterises the first book, that of *Elohim* belongs to the second. It arose out of two smaller collections; since xlii.-xlix. are from the sons of Korah, and li.-lxx. from David. Probably li.-lxx. were all put together as David's; the inscriptions of several with his name having dropped out. What led to this book was perhaps the idea of giving Davidic compositions which had not been gathered into the first. It was of course made after the captivity. Psalms of that period are found in it. Ewald supposes that xlii.-l. were moved out of their original place after the seventy-second by a very old mistake; but this is arbitrary.¹

The third book also originated in smaller collections; for the odes of Asaph stand together at the commencement (lxxiii.-lxxxiii), followed by Korahite ones for the most part. It has only one psalm attributed to David, i.e. the eighty-sixth, and that incorrectly. It is supposed by Jahn that this collector wishing to append his own portion to the preceding ones, and not having in view the songs of David, subjoined a formula to the seventy-second to the effect that the psalms of David were ended.² This is more probable than the opinion of Carpozov and Eichhorn, which regards the formula as the closing subscription of a collection that had subsisted by itself. But the words are meant to separate what precedes from the following, like the analogous phrases in Job xxxi. 40 וְהָיָה דְבַר אֵלֹהִים and Jer. li. 64 וְהָיָה דְבַר יְרֵמְיָהוּ. Olshausen thinks that the collector of the second and third books was the same because the name of Deity, *Elohim*, for the most part prevails.³ But Jeho-

¹ Die Poesischen Bücher des alten Bundes, I. pp. 193-194.

² Einleitung, II. Theil, pp. 718, 719. ³ Die Psalmen erklärt, Einleitung, p. 31.

vah predominates from the eighty-fourth, which shews that the second and third were made up by different persons. Olshausen, indeed, to avoid the force of this conclusion, thinks that the last six psalms of the third were a later appendix from another hand; but this is an arbitrary hypothesis.

The fourth book has in it one minor collection; psalms xcii.-c. being like one another in contents, language, tone, and belonging to one time.

The fifth book contains two minor collections—viz., *the songs of degrees* (cxx.-cxxxiv.), and the hallelujah-psalms (cxlvi.-cl.). These two books were probably made by one collector; for the use of *Jehovah* prevails in them with a very few exceptions. He arranged and completed the fourth before the fifth; because if he had had the constituent parts of the latter when he made the former, he would probably have terminated the fourth more suitably than with the 106th psalm. Whoever he was, it seems clear that he had the first three books before him, because the 108th is made up of lvii. and lx. in the second book; and the use of *Jehovah* peculiar to the second book is repeated.

If these observations respecting the collecting and arrangement of the psalms be correct, it will appear that both order and disorder are visible in the work. Want of order is visible in that David's psalms are scattered through all the five books; that Asaph's and the Korahite compositions are not all together; that temple and festival odes are separated; and that those of the same age are apart. On the other hand, amid this disarrangement there is method in that the prevailing use of certain names of Deity characterises the books; that the greater part of David's psalms are together in the first book; that the songs of Asaph and the Korahites are *generally* beside one another; that the lyrics of David's singers make a book (lxxiii.-lxxxix.); and that the songs of degrees and hallelujah-psalms follow each other.

The account given of the manner of making up the whole work will explain why various psalms occur twice. They appeared in different collections—minor or book collections—and when the five divisions were brought together into one they were allowed to stand. All that are repeated are of small extent and widely separated. It will also serve to explain how it is that old and new poems are put together; and why, in the collection that bears David's name and is said to have all his compositions, there are psalms proceeding from different authors and times, and *the prayers of David the son of Jesse are not ended*, others occurring subsequently with his name in the title. The various books were uncritically, and to some extent arbitrarily,

compiled, on the basis of minor collections; without any one principle permeating them all, much less pervading each separately. Sometimes a principle may be discovered partially operating; sometimes not. Regularity and want of order are too obvious to justify the hypothesis of one redactor except for the mere adding together of the five. That person may indeed have been the collector of the last two books. The whole work with its five divisions appeared some time after the return from captivity, but before the Greek translation of Jesus Sirach 130 B.C.; for all had then been translated into Greek; and also before John Hyrcanus (135 B.C.), under whom Olshausen puts it. The Chronicles were subsequently compiled, as has been inferred from the fact that a temple song is placed by that compiler in David's time, which is borrowed from the latest portions of the present collection. Even the doxology of the fourth book is included in that temple-ode (1 Chron. xvi. 7-36). If then the Chronicles were later, the Psalter must be put about 350 B.C.

IX. USAGE OF THE NAMES JEHOVAH AND ELOHIM.—The usage of the names *Jehovah* and *Elohim* in different books of the Psalms is peculiar. In the first book *Jehovah* appears 272 times, *Elohim* by itself 15 times. In the second book *Elohim* occurs 164 times, *Jehovah* 30 times. In the third, *Jehovah* appears 44 times, *Elohim* 43. The third and fourth have *Jehovah* exclusively, for Ps. cviii. is made up of two Elohist psalms of the second book. How can this distinction of names be explained? Different answers are given by critics. Ewald resolves it into the taste of those who collected and arranged the different parts.¹ This is favoured by a comparison of the same psalms appearing in different books, as liii. and xiv., lxx. and xl. The second book passed through the hands of a redactor who preferred *Elohim* to *Jehovah*, and therefore altered the prevailing name, while he allowed *Jehovah* to stand untouched in various places. The feeling which prompted the later Jews to avoid pronouncing *Jehovah* must have arisen gradually, influencing some authors to substitute *Elohim* for it. It is probable that those who collected the Psalms had also a feeling of this nature. *Jehovah* was the prevailing name, which the original authors employed. For it *Elohim* was substituted in many cases by later persons. De Wette is inclined to resolve the usage into the different ages of the psalms. This is hardly sufficient, because *Elohim* and *Jehovah* came to be equally applied at one time. Delitzsch² again thinks that the origin of the distinction is based upon imitation of the Pentateuch, where the two names are applied with

¹ Die Poetischen Bücher, I. pp. 191, 192.

² Symbolae ad Psalmos illustrand. isagogicae, p. 21 et seqq.

discrimination, a hypothesis arbitrary and baseless. Keil¹ again accounts for it from design on the part of the writers, to meet and counteract the influence arising from the contracted notions of the surrounding heathen with their national and local deities, over the covenant-people, who might possibly be led to think of Jehovah the God of Israel as a limited national God. This view is too artificial, attributing to the sacred writers what would scarcely have influenced them to such an extent. Besides, it is too narrow to embrace all the facts. It only explains a part of them. Some poets preferred Elohim, some Jehovah. This will account for the usage in part. Their own tastes were their guide. But the collectors introduced considerable alteration, making different epithets predominate, according to their feelings in relation to the name *Jehovah*. The peculiarity of usage now observable must have chiefly proceeded from them.²

X. DUPLICATES.—How comes it that we have duplicate psalms in the collection? Thus the fourteenth psalm is repeated in the fifty-third with some unimportant changes. The Rabbins attributed this to the author himself, *i.e.*, to David. He is supposed to have made a second edition. The changes were not deliberately made by a later writer, so Hengstenberg argues, because such a liberty would hardly have been taken with a psalm of David; and because the later form in that case would either have been excluded from the psalter, or substituted for the first form, or immediately connected with it. Hence he infers that the original author re-wrote it with modifications; but without any intention to supersede the use of the original composition. In the Old Testament times, and especially that of David, authors did not practice this kind of *retractatio*. They did not critically and minutely correct their own compositions. The thing is comparatively modern.³ Had David himself made the collection of psalms, there would be more probability in the hypothesis; but as it arose out of smaller collections after the return from captivity, the idea of a second edition of any poem proceeding from himself must be rejected. It may be noticed that Jehovah is changed into Elohim, the latter word being a characteristic mark of the second book. This shews the hand of him who made the second book; and excludes the idea of his having inserted the fifty-third or second copy *inadvertently*, forgetting that it existed already. The most important difference between the texts lies in the sixth verse of the fifty-third, which stands for the fifth and sixth of the fourteenth. It is probable, however, that there was an original identity, because the remains of it may be detected in the *same* or *similar* letters. The original iden-

¹ Einleitung, p. 346.

² See Hupfeld, Die Psalmen, vol. iv. p. 461.

³ See Hengstenberg's Commentar, u. s. w., vol. i. p. 276 et seqq.

tity was disturbed by the accidental mistakes of transcribers. In the course of transcription and oral tradition the variations in words and letters were shaped into their present form. The connection in liii. 6 is loose and singular; shewing its ~~un~~originality. Nor indeed is that in xiv. 5, 6 very natural. Which of the two texts is the older can scarcely be made out. Ewald regards the fifty-third as the original.¹ Certainly the diction favours this opinion. But the sixth verse is less original than xiv. 5, 6. We do not agree with Paulus, Rosenmüller, and De Wette, who see in it a later addition with relation to a certain occurrence.

Another example occurs in the eighteenth psalm and 2 Sam. xxii., of which Hengstenberg has given the same view, viz., that David himself prepared a twofold form of the composition; and therefore that both are equally authentic and inspired. But the character of the variations is not such as to shew an *intentional* revision and alteration, whichever text be taken for the original one. It shews an *accidental* origin. The psalm-readings are unquestionably superior. Hence Von Lengerke is wrong in assigning nearly an equal value to both; much more Bleek, who attributes a very decided preponderance of original readings to 2 Sam. xxii. There are very few readings indeed in 2 Sam. xxii. which are preferable. We attribute the variations of that text to negligence in transcription and oral tradition. The orthography is defective in vowel letters. The readings which differ are generally careless, prosaically inclining, and incorrect. Thus in the twenty-eighth verse כִּי אֶתֶּר becomes וְאֶת in 2 Samuel; and the second member substitutes וְעֵינֶיךָ עַל רָמִים תִּשְׁפֹּל *and thou lettest down thine eyes upon the lofty,* for, וְעֵינֶיךָ רָמוֹת תִּשְׁפֹּל *and the lofty eyes thou shalt bring down;* the former an unusual and unsuitable expression, falsely translated by Hengstenberg, *thine eyes against the high that thou mayest bring them down.* Acute and able examinations of the readings are given by Hitzig and Hupfeld.

The seventieth psalm is a repetition of the fortieth from the fourteenth to the eighteenth verses inclusive. It is difficult to say how a piece of one became another psalm. Hengstenberg, as before, refers the twofold edition to David himself; while Hitzig similarly assumes an arbitrary alteration on the part of the author, whom he supposes to be Jeremiah. The variations probably originated in the course of the traditional use of the psalm. Elohim is generally substituted for Jehovah, in the text of the seventieth. This is a characteristic of the second

¹ Studien und Kritiken for 1829, p. 744 et seqq.

book. Ewald and Hitzig give the preference to the text of the fortieth; which they think the original. On the other hand, Hupfeld prefers on the whole that of the seventieth. Where such masters of Hebrew disagree, the question is a difficult one. We incline to the opinion of Hupfeld; though some readings in the fortieth are certainly preferable to the corresponding ones in the seventieth.

Five verses in the fifty-seventh psalm, *i.e.*, 8-12, reappear in the 108th with some alterations; and lx. 8-11 in the 108th also. Thus the 108th is made up of pieces of two others; shewing the hand of one destitute of originality and poetic inspiration. The two parts do not hang well together when put into close juxtaposition; and the variations of the 108th shew the originality of fifty-seven and sixty.

In the 144th psalm a free use is made of the eighteenth. The latter is Davidic, the former not. The later poet of the 144th imitated the earlier. The likeness is most apparent in verses 1, 2, 5, 6, 7; but it is also visible in 3, 9, 15. The theophany of the 144th is much inferior to that of the eighteenth.

The 105th and 96th psalms are also the original of 1 Chron. xvi. 8-36.

XI. POETICAL CHARACTERISTICS.—The psalms are properly *lyric*, that is, they are songs or odes. This is the earliest species of poetry, because it is the immediate expression of the feelings as they arise: simple, spontaneous, unstudied, and natural. All emotions therefore are poured forth in it. Elevated and depressed feelings, passions strong and vehement, soft and plaintive, are expressed. The peculiarity of the lyrical song consists of *the form* given to it by the musical accompaniment; or rather, the rhythm and time for which it is fitted to be sung and played to.

The psalter is termed by De Wette a *lyric anthology*, because it contains the lyric productions of different authors at various times; the title "psalms of David" being no more than a *denominatio a potiori*. It contains, however, only fragments of the Hebrews' lyric poetry. In Gen. iv. 23, 24; Ex. xv.; Judges v., we have specimens earlier than David. The directions given by Moses immediately before his death have the appearance of being cast in the same form. The lyric reached its culminating point in David, who carried it to its highest perfection. It has been asked if the lyric poetry of the Hebrews was devoted exclusively to the service of religion. The answer must be in the negative, when we look at David's elegy over Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i. 19-27), and the song of the well (Num. xxi. 17, etc.). The Song of Solomon also refers to

common life, its subject being the chaste and faithful love of a maiden. So also the forty-fifth psalm is secular. Very few poems of the latter class were composed. The religious greatly prevailed, nearly all being of that character. The Hebrews were a people into whose ideas generally the religious element was interwoven by means of their varied institutions. They referred events immediately to Jehovah. Hence their songs were dictated by the feelings towards God which constitute their life and beauty. In referring to the few secular pieces scattered throughout the Old Testament we do not mean to indicate that these are all the lyrics of that class which the Hebrews composed. It would be unfair so to restrict their number. All that need be asserted is, that such odes were very few in comparison with the religious ones. A theocratic people, whose history is a foreshadow of the Christian life, could not but have their souls most moved and elevated by the contemplation of that Being whose manifestations so visibly surrounded them.¹ Lyric poetry contains within itself the germs of other species, the elegiac, gnomic, idyllic, dramatic. These are only the development of the lyric, which easily passes over into them. Hence some find elegiac and gnomic psalms, idylls, and dramatic odes. All, however, are *lyric*, that being the general and more comprehensive appellation; while the others are specific. Some are *didactic* or *ethical*, as the 119th. The twenty-third is a sort of idyll or pastoral poem. Many are of a plaintive or elegiac nature, as the forty-second. The nearest approach to the dramatic is the twenty-fourth psalm. But we decidedly object to the opinion of Horsley that "the far greater part of the psalms are a sort of dramatic ode, consisting of dialogues between persons sustaining certain characters."² The writers have sometimes thrown their ideas into forms which appear to involve different speakers, to give animation and vivacity to their compositions. Alternate or responsive choirs should not be assumed in such cases. It is probable, indeed, that the temple psalms, and all intended for the public service of Jehovah, were sung by choirs. "But it by no means follows," says De Wette, "that we must divide the psalms themselves into choruses: it is probable that the chorus simply repeated."³ All the psalms, or even the majority, were not composed for use in the public service of God. Some were written with that design; others with no such intention; while others were afterwards adapted to it by addition or modification. Examples of these may be found in xv. 24; vii. 22; and xxv.

¹ See De Wette's *Commentar*, *Einleitung*, pp. 1, 2.

² Preface to translation of *Psalms*, p. xiii. *Theological works*, vol. iv.

³ *Commentar*, *Einleit.* p. 66.

The distinguishing feature of Hebrew poetry is a certain rhythm of sentiment. Thought corresponds to thought in repetition, amplification, contrast, or response. This peculiarity expresses itself in the outward form and sound, in parallelism of the members of a period, or in other words, a rhythmical proportion between them. The divisions of the thought are indicated by rhythmical divisions or parallel lines. Parallelism is of different kinds. De Wette has specified four.

1. Where there is a perfect resemblance or antithesis of thoughts, the words will be equal in number, and will sometimes have even a certain resemblance in sound. This may be called *the perfect* or *original* parallelism, which coincides with metre and rhyme, though it is not the same. As an example take viii. 5 :

What is man, that thou art mindful of him,
And the son of man that thou visitest him !

Here there is *resemblance* of thought, equality of words, and similarity of sound.

As an example of *antithesis* of thought with equality in words, take xx. 9 :

They are brought down and fallen ;
But we are risen and stand upright.

An example of *progression* of thought, Ps. xix. 8 :

The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul :
The statutes of the Lord are sure, making wise the simple.

In these three examples we have, according to Lowth's terminology, the synonymous, antithetic, and synthetic parallelisms.

2. This external proportion of words is not often observed in the psalter. The members are often unequal. The inequality is of different kinds.

(a) The simple unequal parallelism, in which one member is too short for the other, for example, Ps. lxviii. 33 :

Sing unto God, ye kingdoms of the earth ;
Sing praises to the Lord.

Ps. xxxvii. 13 :

The Lord shall laugh at him ;
For he seeth that his day is coming.

(b) The complex unequal parallelism, having either the first or second members composed of two propositions, by which means a complex member corresponds to a simple one. Examples occur in Ps. xxxvi. 7 :

{ Thy righteousness is like the great mountains ;
{ Thy judgments are a great deep ;
O Lord thou preservest man and beast.

According to the thought, this is the *synonymous*. Another example, which presents the *antithetic* parallelism, is in Ps. xv. 4 :

In whose eyes a vile person is contemned,
 { But who honoureth them that fear the Lord
 { Who sweareth to his neighbour and changeth not.

Another which is *synthetic* is,

{ He that putteth not out his money to usury
 { Nor taketh a bribe against the innocent ;
 He that doeth these things shall never be moved.

(c) Sometimes the simple member is disproportionally small, and then the inequality is still more striking, as,

{ I have announced thy righteousness in the great congregation,
 { Lo, I have not restrained my lips,
 O Lord, thou knowest it.

There is frequently a parallelism in each proposition and member, as lxix. 4 :

{ *More than the hairs of mine head* ARE THEY WHO HATE ME WITHOUT REASON ;
 { *Mighty* ARE THEY WHO SEEK TO DESTROY ME BEING MINE ENEMIES WITHOUT CAUSE ;
 I must restore what I took not away.

(d) Sometimes the complex member is increased to three or four propositions, as i. 3 :

{ He is like a tree planted by water brooks,
 { And bringeth forth its fruit in its season,
 { And its leaves do not wither ;
 And all that he doeth shall prosper.

(e) Instead of the full subordinate parallelism, we sometimes find only a short clause or supplement, mostly in the second member, as Ps. v. 2, 3.

{ Give ear to my words, O Lord,
 { Consider my meditation.
 { Hearken to the voice of my cry, my King and my God :
 For unto thee will I pray.

In all these forms of parallelism, the proportion is in the thoughts, not in the extent of the words.

3. The equality is sometimes restored by both members instead of one, becoming complex. This kind of parallelism arises out of the preceding, in which but one of the members is complex, causing an unequal parallelism. Here there are both fullness of thought and perfect proportion of form. An example occurs in Ps. xxxi. 11 :

For my life is spent with grief,
 And my years with sighing ;
 My strength faileth because of mine iniquity,
 And my bones are consumed.

This is a *synonymous* parallelism.

Or the members may have alternate correspondence, as Ps. v. 26.

Let them be ashamed and brought to confusion together
That rejoice at mine hurt ;
Let them be clothed with shame and dishonour,
That magnify themselves against me.

An example of the antithetic is in xxx. 6.

For a moment passes in his anger,
A life in his favour ;
At evening weeping returns,
And at morning joy.

As there is an alternate correspondence at times in the case of the synonymous, so there is also in the antithetic, as Ps. xlv. 3.

With thy hand didst thou drive out the heathen,
And plantedst them ;
Thou didst afflict the people,
And didst enlarge them.

There are also instances of double parallelism of the synthetic class, as ciii. 11, 12.

As the heaven is high above the earth,
So great is his mercy to them that fear him ;
As far as the east is from the west,
So far hath he removed our transgressions from us.

There are also triplet parallelisms, both of the synonymous and synthetic class, as Ps. xciii. 3, 4.

The floods, O Lord,
The floods lift up their voice ;
The floods lift up their roaring.
Mightier than the voice of many waters,
Yea, than the mighty waves of the sea,
Is Jehovah in his lofty habitation.

Of the antithetic, we have Ps. lxxvii. 18, 19.

Thy thunder roared in the whirlwind,
Thy lightnings enlightened the world ;
The earth trembled and shook.
Thy way was through the sea,
And thy path through great waters,
And thy footsteps could not be known.

4. Sometimes there is a *rhythmical* species of parallelism consisting *merely in the form* of the period. Here there is no rhythm in thought. Examples of this occur in all the preceding kinds.

(a) With the number of words nearly equal, as Ps. xix. 12.

By them also is thy servant warned,
In keeping of them there is great reward.

(b) With great disproportion in the number of verses, as xxx. 3.

Jehovah my God,
I cried to thee, and thou healedest me.

(c) With a double and a simple member, as xiv. 7.

{ O that the deliverance of Israel were come out of Zion!
{ When the Lord bringeth back the captivity of his people,
Jacob shall rejoice and Israel be glad.

(d) With two double members, as Ps. xxxi. 23.

I said in my distress,
I am cut off from before thine eyes;
Truly thou hast heard the voice of my supplication,
When I cried unto thee.

This form of parallelism brings us to the utmost limits of the province of rhythm, very near to prose.¹

Analogous to the parallelism of verses there appears in Hebrew poetry, not always, but often, an artificial rhythmical structure of several verses in relation to one another, similar to *strophes*. It may be well designated by this term when it returns with regularity in the compass of one poem. Parts consisting of various verses that run even and parallel to each other, deserve the appellation. Various psalms present such complex rhythmical structure. The strophes consist of two, three, or more verses. In some instances the body, or only the leading part of the psalm, is distributed into strophical members; while an introduction, a termination, or both, stand outside the structure. In the detection of such strophes there is scope for much ingenuity, and at the same time, for arbitrary conjecture, since they are not very obvious in many cases. Where an odd verse or refrain occurs, it facilitates the discovery of them; though such refrain is not always conditioned by an evenly strophic period. Take an example from the forty-second and forty-third psalms which should be but one.

As a hart pants for the water brooks,
So pants my soul for thee, O Lord;
My soul thirsts for God, the living God:
When shall I come and appear before God?

My tears have been my food day and night,
While they say to me continually, "Where is thy God?"
I will think of it—and pour out my soul in me—
How I once walked in procession with the multitude to the house of God,
With sounds of joy and praise, with the festive multitude.

*Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted in me?
Hope thou in God; for I shall yet praise him,
The help of my countenance and my God.*

¹ See De Wette's *Commentar, Einleitung*, p. 46, et seqq.

~~My soul is cast down within me;~~
 Therefore will I remember thee from the land of Jordan and the Hermons,
 From the mountain of reproach.
 Deep calls to deep at the rushing of thy waterfalls,
 All thy waves and thy billows have gone over me.

In the day Jehovah commands his kindness,
 And in the night his song is with me,
 A prayer to the God of my life.
 I will say to God my rock: Why hast thou forgotten me?
 Why must I go mourning because of the oppression of the enemy?

With a crushing in my bones have my oppressors despised me;
 While they say to me continually, "Where is thy God?"
Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted in me?
Hope thou in God; for I shall yet praise him,
The help of my countenance and my God.

Judge me, O God, and defend my cause against a merciless nation!
 From the unjust and deceitful man deliver me!
 For thou art the God of my refuge; why hast thou cast me off?
 Why must I go mourning because of the oppression of the enemy?
 O send forth thy light and thy truth, let them guide me,
 Let them lead me to thy holy mountain and thy dwelling-place.

That I may come to the altar of God,
 To the God of my joy and exultation,
 And I may praise thee on the harp, O God, my God.
Why art thou cast down, O my soul, and why art thou disquieted in me?
Hope thou in God; for I shall yet praise him,
The help of my countenance and my God.

Here are three strophes, each terminating with the same refrain. Another example of strophe-structure, but not marked by a refrain, occurs in the twenty-third psalm.

1 The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.
 On green pastures he makes me to lie down,
 He leads me to the still waters.

2 He revives my soul,
 He leads me in the paths of righteousness,
 For his name's sake.

Even when I walk in the valley of darkness,
 I will fear no evil for thou art with me;
 Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me.

3 Thou preparest a table before me,
 In the presence of mine enemies;
 Thou hast anointed mine head with oil,
 My cup runs over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life,
 And I shall dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

Here are three strophes, each consisting of two verses. In the first God is represented as a faithful shepherd; in the second as a sure guide or leader; in the third as a bountiful host, the joys of whose house are lasting.

In the case of the seventy-ninth psalm, which consists of

three strophes, each containing four verses, the last verse is a sort of epiphonema, and stands apart therefore from the strophe-structure.

In the eighty-second the first verse forms a peculiar introduction; and the eighth an epiphonema. Subtracting these, there are two strophes of three verses each.

Hengstenberg appears to us to have indulged in strophe-building much more than can be reasonably approved. Unless there be in a psalm a perceptible similarity of thought, extending over several verses in rhythmical forms bearing some analogy, it is safer to divide it into parts or sections, not strophes. Thus we do not, with that critic, recognise three strophes in the thirty-fifth psalm, viz., 1-10, 11-18, 19-28. The third merely repeats and varies the ideas of the other two; whereas the latter present a regular succession of thought. It is true that each terminates with a vow of thanksgiving; but like-proportioned strophes are not observable. So also we should not say that the seventy-second has two strophes, one of ten and the other of seven verses, i.e., 1-10, 11-17. Rather does it consist of three sections, verses 1-7, 8-15, 16, 17. On the other hand, Olshausen is inclined to deny the existence of strophes in cases where they may be discerned. Thus the 128th psalm is plainly divisible into two strophes of three verses each, which begin with the same statement, *Happy is he who feareth the Lord*. Yet Olshausen says there is not sufficient ground for such separation. To us it appears undeniable.

The division of verses into parallel lines, if it be done properly, will often facilitate the sense. But the distribution into strophes is as important. Unless both be carefully attended to, the poetic beauty, rhythm, and meaning will be partially lost to the reader. Thus we should arrange psalm cx. 1, 2.

1. Jehovah's oracle to my Lord:
Sit at my right hand,
Till I make thine enemies thy footstool.
2. The sceptre of thy power Jehovah sends out of Zion.
Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.

But Rogers¹ arranges the first verse thus—

Jehovah's oracle to my Lord, sit at my right hand,
Till I make thine enemies thy footstool;

which is not so good. The fifth verse consists of three lines in the same manner.

The age and language of particular psalms do not always bear the relation which might be expected. Purity and ease of diction

¹ The book of Psalms in Hebrew metrically arranged, etc. p. 223.

characterise the later more than the earlier ones. As a general rule, the style and language of the older is stiffer and more difficult than that of the later. Their ideas and images, however, are stronger and more original. Some psalms composed after the captivity are equal in all respects to those of David. De Wette has proposed the rule, that a psalm should be considered older in proportion to the awkwardness of its phraseology, as well as the fullness, freedom, and compression of its thoughts; and later in proportion to the ease, elegance, and facility of its language in addition to the perspicuous arrangement of its matter.¹ This may be accepted with some limitation. The poetical merit is often in an inverse proportion to the age. Those attributed to the sons of Korah occupy a high rank in sublimity and beauty; and many belonging to the time of the exile are not less elegant. It is true that those of later origin often bear marks of imitation, especially the plaintive in tone. David composed a number of this class, which formed models for succeeding poets. The oldest, being freshest and most original in matter, form, and language, were copied by later authors; for the ideas and phrases are little varied. Perhaps the national calamities of the Jews suggested many of these. Similarity of situation will in part account for their likeness. The alphabetic and hallelujah psalms also present marks of imitation. The 50th and 139th may be taken as odes of great poetical merit and beauty. Both are later than David; the former, earlier than the latter, and having more of the prophetic cast, vigorous in tone, and vivid in description; the latter more philosophical and abstract, but allied to the class of plaintive songs. The 131st may also be quoted as beautifully poetical and religious. It is later than David. On the other hand, the 116th bears marks of imitation, or at least of reminiscences of earlier poems, and presents a prosaic diction. Neither the ideas nor language exhibit poetic inspiration or excellence, though pious feeling pervades it. Again, the thirty-eighth psalm is of inferior merit, and bears marks of imitating the sixth.

XII. MESSIANIC PSALMS.—It has been generally held that various psalms refer to the Messiah, his sufferings, death, majesty, and power. Both Jews and Christians have found allusion to him; the former, because they thought the description most suitable to his person and character; the latter, because the New Testament applies different passages to him. Such psalms have been divided into the two classes of *exclusively* and *secondarily* Messianic. According to this classification, some are directly prophetic of him, as the 110th; while others have

¹ Commentar, Einleit., p. 16.

only a secondary reference. The primary sense of the latter belongs to David, the illustrious ancestor and type of Messiah, or to some pious sufferer; the higher and secondary sense to David's greater son. Here a distinction has been made between the original meaning, or that which the writer himself connected with the words, and the additional sense lying in the words through the mysterious operation of the Holy Spirit and referring to Christ. We greatly doubt the exegesis which supposes such two-fold reference or sense. The language has but *one meaning*; although it may be *applied* in more ways than one. Grammatico-historical interpretation sanctions no more than a single sense. Others divide them into these two classes: 1st. Such as announced the sufferings and death of the Saviour. 2nd. Such as related to his power and majesty. Under the former head are put psalms xvi., xxii., xl.; under the latter, ii., xlv., lxxii., cx.

The chief reason for pronouncing so many psalms Messianic is the alleged authority of the New Testament writers who apply passages to Christ. But though *inspired* they were not *infallible*. In their explanation of psalms they may have followed the traditional interpretation of the Jews: or their own subjectivity may appear. As long as inspiration is not tantamount to infallibility, a fact which is almost axiomatic, we are at liberty to look at the Messianic exposition of a psalm by the apostles and New Testament writers generally in the light of the laws of grammatical interpretation. If those laws be observed, the interpretation is correct; if they be violated, it must be rejected. What says the Hebrew original itself; not the Septuagint which the Christian writers followed; nor even those writers themselves? If Christ indeed clearly affirms *on his own authority* that a psalm was predictive of himself, that settles the matter. No doubt should then cross the mind. But the case is different in relation to human authors who had the Spirit of God *in measure*, not *above measure*. The words of *the original*, fairly explained, are a higher rule. They are the only standard by which every quotation should be tried. But we are not shut up to the conclusion that the apostles were mistaken in their use of the psalms; though their Messianic applications of them in the New Testament must not give rise to a rule binding on every Christian to explain the psalms in question as properly Messianic. Those who follow such a canon show that they understand neither the Old Testament nor the New. When individual ideas expressed in several psalms, such as the forty-fifth, contain truths that seemed to the apostles and other New Testament writers to find their highest fulfilment in Christ; and especially when the whole of the Old Testament

ment by necessary consequence point to Christ and the apostolic period, the applications in question are perfectly justified by the substance of the Old Testament itself, as well as by individual utterances containing deep truths of everlasting significance. The organic connection between the two Testaments warrants the quotations to which we allude; for the same Spirit quickened the various writers in both parts of the Bible. The highest and holiest longings of Old Testament seers were *virtually* Messianic. They pointed onward to a future far better than the present out of which they sprung. The best hopes of the old saints were realised in the dispensation introduced by Christ. Places of the Old Testament seen in the light of Jesus the Messiah by the apostles, quickened a new life in connection with Him; and the deep truths contained in them took a sudden hold of their spirits; what wonder then that the passages should be directly referred to the great Deliverer and find their utmost accomplishment in his person and reign? This however is no reason why we should find a *historical, Messianic sense* in the passages; or suppose that they were *consciously* meant of Christ. The proper, original sense is one thing; the New Testament application another.

Let us now look at the several psalms which are regarded as *Messianic*.

Psalm xvi. The last four verses of this psalm are quoted by Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, ii. 25, etc.; and the tenth verse by Paul in the same book; both apostles referring them to Christ and his resurrection. But the language of the ~~ode~~ refuses to admit the interpretation. The word מָוֶן (verse 10) does not mean *corruption* but *the grave*; and therefore the rendering of it by διαφθορά in Acts ii. 27 is incorrect. The proper reading is הַיְדֵי־הַקְדֹּשִׁים *holy ones* or *saints*; not the singular, *thy holy one*; shewing that it refers to the pious generally. *Suffering his pious ones not to see the grave is to deliver them from the peril of death.* The resurrection of Messiah, or of men generally, is an idea which was foreign to David or the poets of the older time. Only the later Jews entertained it. And it is incomprehensible how the poet could transfer his hopes and feelings to the person of another coming long after him. The subjective character of psalm-poetry forbids the transference. As Hupfeld affirms, it is psychologically impossible.¹ Besides, the fourth verse is inapplicable to Christ, "their drink-offerings of blood will I not offer, nor take up their names into my lips." How can the Messiah say with propriety that He will not join in the impious services of idolaters, nor even *name the names* of their

¹ Die Psalmen, vol. i., p. 302.

deities? The only way in which the psalm can be called Messianic is by supposing the language of it *ideal*, instead of *literal* and *historical*. The feelings and hopes of the poet are simply ideal. They are aspirations uttered in poetry. As such they find their full realization in the resurrection of Christ. That fact alone contains a complete verification and fulfilment of them. The poet seems to have been carried away in spiritual aspiration and hope beyond the current ideas of his time, so as to anticipate a period when he should be freed from the power of the grave and enjoy intimate communion with God. His imagination takes a higher flight into the future; painting in the indefinite language of longing hope the deliverance and joy he should have hereafter. Such an ideal finds its full truth in Messiah alone; though the writer was unconscious of His person or resurrection, and spake *out of* and *in relation to* purified humanity itself. The author had not the Messiah in his mind, though his words find their reality in him. Those who wish to see the exclusively Messianic interpretation effectually refuted, may consult Hengstenberg's arguments against it.¹

Psalm xxii. This psalm is regarded as Messianic because various parts of it are quoted and applied as such in the New Testament; in John's Gospel xix. 34, and Heb. ii. 11, 12. There is a singular coincidence between some passages and what befel the Redeemer in his sufferings and crucifixion; while the commencement, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," was repeated by Him on the cross. But though there are various remarkable correspondences between the psalm and the history of Christ's personal sufferings, we cannot approve of its being interpreted as properly Messianic. It was not meant to be predictive. It contains a prayer. He who prays in it does not speak of another *but of himself*, as Hofmann² rightly affirms; though Reinke³ strangely asserts the opposite. Even Keil refrains from the untenable position of his orthodox brother. The writer did not think of Messiah because,

(a) The sufferings of the speaker had continued for a time. He had cried to God for help by day and night in vain (ver. 2).

(b) The description of his distress in the prospect of deadly peril, and his anxiety in prayer to be delivered from death and saved alive, are unsuitable to Christ, who gave himself up unto the death *freely* for all.

(c) It is psychologically inconceivable, as Hengstenberg affirms, that the poet should identify himself with the condition

¹ Commentar ueber die Psalmen, vol. i. pp. 338, 339.

² Der Schriftbeweis, vol. ii. erste Abtheilung, p. 189, second edition.

³ Dee Messianische Psalmen, vol. i. p. 107 et seqq.

and feelings of another. How could David or any other extend his own consciousness to that of his offspring, without destroying personal identity? The sufferings of a righteous man who is persecuted by his enemies, are the subject, not Messiah. Well may Hengstenberg say that the direct and exclusive reference of the psalm to Christ presents such difficulties that one cannot feel at perfect liberty to adopt it, but is rather inclined to look about for some other interpretation which may satisfy the mind. His own hypothesis indeed is quite as difficult, viz., that the ideal person of the righteous One is referred to.¹

Psalm xl. This psalm has also been considered Messianic by many interpreters, because the sixth, seventh, and eighth verses are referred to Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews x. 5-7. This is opposed to the meaning of the original words. The LXX., whom the writer of the epistle follows, translate the Hebrew incorrectly. What the psalm speaks of is not the abolishing of sacrifices by the self-sacrifice of Christ, but of obedience to God and thankfulness to Him. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes the words of the psalm for the purpose of expressing in Scripture terms the contrast between the Old Testament sacrifices and that of Him who not only offered himself, but came into the world to obey the will of God by such a self-sacrifice.² Christ is not the speaker in the psalm, nor does another speak of him. This is shewn by the twelfth verse, in which the writer refers to his innumerable iniquities; and by the earnest prayers of the sufferer to be delivered from his painful condition, which are out of place in relation to Messiah.

Psalm ii. This psalm is quoted in the New Testament and applied to Messiah by the early Christian disciples in Jerusalem (Acts iv. 25); by Paul (Acts xiii. 33); and by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 5). We may therefore presume that it was the current interpretation of the day. Yet internal evidence is against the exposition. The Christian idea of Messiah is different from that which is here presented. Christ does not break the nations with a rod of iron; because his kingdom is *spiritual* not *carnal*. Yet the poet speaks of the government of the world being given to the king portrayed. How can this apply to an Israelite monarch. It only applies *poetically*. Soon after Solomon ascended the throne, an inspired poet composed this ode concerning him, representing him as a mighty conqueror who should subdue and rule over the nations. In strains of poetic exaggeration he sang the praises of the glorious monarch. Delitzsch errs greatly in assigning the ode to Heze-

¹ Commentar, vol. ii. p. 8.

² See Hofmann's Schriftbeweis, vol. ii., zweiter Abtheilung, pp. 2, 3, second edn.

kiah's time. The hopes and aspirations of the poet exceed their usual measure. They swell beyond the actual and realisable into an ideal region of anticipation. In a moment of high inspiration, he is carried away in imagination to represent Israel's kingdom stretching over the world. Such an ideal can only be fulfilled in the Messianic time; and therefore the description may so far be termed *Messianic*. But that is different from a definite, designed description of Christ. The poet did not mean to speak of Him. The kingdom of Israel is poetically glorified in its theocratic character; all the proud pretensions and hopes of the nation being attached to it. The national feelings take the form of an ideal elevation of the Hebrew monarchy now represented by Solomon; the poet stretching his fancy so far beyond the historical as to get into the Messianic region where alone his aspirations receive fulfilment.

Hengstenberg has adduced a number of considerations in favour of the proper Messianic sense, such as the phrases, *Son of God, begotten by God* (verse 7); *Son absolutely* (verse 12); *trusting in the Son* (ibid.);¹ forgetting that the *Son of God* is an appellation which may be appropriately given to every king of Israel (being necessarily a figurative one) denoting a certain covenant-relation. In Ex. iv. 22 the people of Israel are called *Jehovah's first-born son*. The term בֶּן in the twelfth verse means *purely* not son; the right translation being "worship purely:" and חֹסֵן יְבוֹ means, trusting in *Jehovah* not Messiah.

Psalm xlv. Two verses (the eighth and ninth) of this psalm are applied to Christ by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. i. 8, 9). The author of that Epistle does not say that the Father addresses the Son as *ὁ θεός*, because λέγει is a term applied to the *Scripture*, and has not for its subject God the Father; because πρὸς does not mean *to* but *concerning*, as in the preceding context; and because the writer himself did not wish to convey the idea that the Son was *directly addressed* by the title *ὁ θεός*. We believe, however, that the New Testament author argues from the application of *ὁ θεός* in Scripture to the Son, that he is superior to angels. It is observable, that the *καὶ* following τοῦ αἰῶνος divides one part of the quotation from another. But we cannot believe with Hofmann, that such separation shews the writer to have taken the king to be a Jewish one anointed by Jehovah, who has fellows or μετόχους, and leaves the readers to regard ὁ θρόνος σου ὁ θεός either as an address to *Jehovah*; or rather as an address to *Jehovah's earthly anointed*, agreeably to the true connection of the original. If, as is said, the condition of his readers obliged him to use the

¹ See Hengstenberg's *Commentary*, vol. i. p. 24 et seqq.

Septuagint, we cannot see that the argument has any other object than to justify the application of *θεός* to the Son by the Greek. Whatever sense he may have attached to the original Hebrew, whether the true one or not, he has certainly employed the Septuagint translation of it to prove that the Son is spoken of as *ὁ θεός*. Hofmann's reasoning virtually makes the writer of the Epistle perceive the correct meaning of the Old Testament passage, and yet employ an incorrect representation of it. The Jews seem to have explained it allegorically of the marriage relation between Messiah and his church, and therefore this allegorical sense was adopted by the early Christians. It does not follow, however, that because some words may bear a Messianic application, the entire ode must be Messianic. We must look at the original meaning of the words, not the sense put into them by later readers. The psalm is evidently an epithalamium or nuptial song on the marriage of some king with a king's daughter; whether on Solomon's marriage with the daughter of Egypt's king, is uncertain. It is not Messianic, because the description does not suit the person and character of Christ. Who can apply the praises of the king's warlike attributes to the Prince of Peace, without offending propriety, truth, and taste? "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously because of truth and meekness and righteousness; and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies; whereby the people fall under thee." Such language is contrary to the idea of Christ presented in the New Testament. As the production is altogether secular in its character, and the only one in the book that is so, it was very early explained allegorically. Indeed it may have owed its reception into the collection to that very method of interpretation.

The sixth verse should be translated, "*thy God's throne, i.e., thy throne given and protected by God, is for ever and ever,*" etc., expressing a wish for its everlasting continuance. Such hopes are *ideal*, and can be realised only in the reign of Messiah. So far therefore they may be called Messianic. If we translate אֱלֹהִים O God, as the Messianic interpreters do, we obtain the idea of Messiah's *divine nature*, which is foreign to the Old Testament. It has been objected to our version that there is a doubt whether any examples of such syntax occur elsewhere. There are, however, plain analogies to it in מַחְסִי עוֹ my strong refuge (Ps. lxxi. 7); קִמּוֹתִי חַיִּל my strength of power (2 Sam. xxii. 33); דְּרָכְךָ זִמְרָה thy way of lewdness (Ezek. xvi. 27). Why Robinson (translation of Gesenius's Lexicon, fifth edition, p. 55) should

say that the rule of language of which we have given examples is not applicable here, it is impossible to tell. The best Hebraists acknowledge it in this instance, Gesenius, Ewald, Hupfeld, etc.; so that the *ipse-dixit* of the American geographer is worthless.¹ Those who reject the grammatical interpretation in favour of an allegorical one seem to forget the nature of Oriental poetry, which appears overstrained and extravagant in the eyes of a western.

Psalm lxxii. The title of this psalm, which represents Solomon as the author, is evidently incorrect, because the contents and diction bear the stamp of a later period. The ode also harmonises in various particulars with the later prophets. Hence it must have been composed shortly before the exile. No quotation from it occurs in the New Testament. It is not explained there of Christ. Hence there is no apparent necessity urging a certain class of interpreters to make it Messianic. Yet they do so in consequence of the glowing description, the hopes, wishes, and aspirations which could not be realised in an ordinary man or king. The picture is evidently high. *The ideal* of a true king is given, rather than the attainable reality. The poet must have celebrated the ascension to the throne of some Israelite king of David's royal line. In such his hopes culminated. He gives utterance to the greatest aspirations which could possibly attach themselves to a monarch, speaking of him in strains that find their complete embodiment in Messiah alone. A considerable part of the description is ideal, and may so far be termed Messianic. But the poet doubtless spoke of one of David's successors on the throne. This is virtually admitted by Delitzsch, who wrongly supposes that Solomon prescribed the psalm to his subjects as a sort of ecclesiastical prayer.

Psalm cx. The Messianic exposition of this psalm is presupposed in the questions put by Jesus to the Pharisees, "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?" After they say, "the son of David," he asks them, "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?" (Matt. xxii. 41-45). The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews applies a part of it to Christ (Heb. v. 6). Peter does the same in the Acts of the Apostles (ii. 34-35). Notwithstanding these passages, historical interpretation rejects the Messianic view of the

¹ See Gesenius's *Lehrgebäude*, page 735, i.; Ewald renders, *Dein Thron ist Gottes*, and observes, that the LXX. translate erroneously as an address, *O God*. In his *Lehrbuch*, § 274b, he has, *dein Thron ist (Thron) Gottes* = göttlich; Hupfeld has, *Dein Gottes-thron (steht) immer und ewig*. De Wette's rendering is, *Dein Thron Gottes steht immer und ewig*.

psalm. Not to speak of the psychological impossibility before mentioned, viz., that a writer should at once, without the least intimation, identify himself with a person who was to live long after—the language presupposes an individual already existing. Besides, the king is described as a victorious hero, weary with pursuing his enemies, and glad to refresh himself with water out of a brook; after which he pursues his march. “He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head.” Christ uses the *argumentum ad hominem* with the Pharisees; and the apostles followed the tradition of their time in drawing the idea of the Messianic government of the world out of the psalm. The king described is David; and the ode was composed by some of his contemporaries, who clothes the address in the form of an oracle, “Jehovah said to my lord,” i.e., the king spoken of. In David’s reign the ancient union of the kingdom and priesthood, which legendary tradition attributed to Melchizedeck, reappeared among the people of Judah.

The Davidic authorship of the psalm cannot be sustained. Some contemporary poet addressed it to him, on the basis of a divine oracle which the monarch had received as he was setting out on a warlike expedition. “Jehovah said to my lord,” i.e. to the poet’s sovereign. Hence Delitzsch is mistaken in thinking that David here looks into the future of his seed, and has the Messiah present before his eyes.¹ Nor is Hofmann more correct in supposing that the psalm was written for the church, to be always used of the king that should sit on the throne. He argues that the throne of Israel’s king was properly God’s throne on earth, because Jehovah Himself was their monarch; and that therefore the church could always employ the psalm as applicable to the king reigning. Of course the sense culminated in Christ. In this way the *succession of Jewish kings* is regarded as typical of, and preparatory to, the great king.² The interpretation in question is ingenious but unsatisfactory. It excludes David himself. His own person is separated from the succeeding kings. It is surely most improbable, that he who was of all others the most fitting to be included, should be the very one unregarded. In every view, the Davidic authorship leads to a result which necessitates its rejection. Even a very orthodox but superficial critic admits that David did not write it; though he absurdly fixes upon Zerubbabel, asserting, what his party will hardly believe, that “the validity of our Saviour’s argument was not affected by the circumstance that the psalm to which he referred was probably composed by Zerubbabel; and this being the case, he styled the author of the psalm David

¹ Commentar, u. s. w. vol. ii., p. 412.

² Der Schriftbeweis, vol. ii., erste Abtheilung, p. 496 et seqq.

as legitimately as the psalm itself bore the name of David in the superscription. He argued, in short, from the superscription, and so, it may be, acknowledged and confirmed its authority; but he did not criticise or interpret it.”¹

We have thus seen that the directly Messianic sense of certain psalms is chiefly based on the fact that the New Testament writers apply them in that way. Men feel themselves bound to the letter of Scripture so slavishly as to convert the obedience they owe it into an unreasoning service, where freedom is lost. The laws of truth implanted in the mind by the Creator should not be so sinned against. It is now confessed by the straitest critics of a conservative school, that the New Testament writers follow the renderings of the Septuagint where a true exegesis shews them to be incorrect. Hengstenberg himself admits, that the translation of אֱלֹהִים by ἄγγελοι (comp. Heb. i. 6) is untenable. Nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of the grammatical and historical interpretation, not even the letter of the New Testament, else truth and independence are sacrificed. In that case Scripture is injured or perverted, because it is turned aside from the position where a right philosophy places it. We know that things of this nature are done under cover of conscientiousness. A false conscientiousness, that which sins against the inner voice of the reason, should never be followed. When duties clash, there must be some misapprehension. The province of the Bible interpreter, imbued with knowledge and love of truth, is to obey the dictates of a sound and scientific exegesis that does homage to the words of Scripture; and to yield up the result when opposed to reason and conscience. The dead letter must give way to the living voice within, else God is dishonoured. In conformity with a right interpretation we hold that no *direct, definite, conscious* prophecies of Messiah appear in the Psalms. There are unconscious ones—the indefinite longings and hopes of coming restoration—ideas of future completion and glory in the royal line of David. The New Testament writers quoted and applied such passages according to the current sense of their time, without thought of the original meaning intended by the writers. And our Lord followed the same, because it was usually unnecessary to reason with the Jews on any other ground than the *argumentum ad hominem* one. He came not to teach criticism, but to save mankind; not to uphold *the letter*, but to evoke *the spirit* of the Jewish Scripture relating to himself and his work of redemption.

Having considered all the psalms of both classes separately,

¹ Thrupp, Introduction to the study of the Psalms, vol. ii. pp. 210, 211.

it appears that the original meaning does not contain the conscious idea of Messiah. In the first class, where the speaker laments his sufferings and misfortune, from which he earnestly prays to be delivered, he does not give the least intimation that he meant any other than himself. He could scarcely have thought of another, if we are to judge by his language; nor could his readers or hearers have adequately conceived of One who had no existence at the time. In the time of David, the idea of a Messiah had no existence. It was subsequently evolved out of a comparison of the fallen state in the present with the glorious days of David, from whose seed a king was hoped and longed for, who should restore the golden age. Such an idea did not involve a *suffering*, much less a *dying* Messiah. A powerful, righteous, glorious king was the ideal. It is remarkable, however, that the descriptions contained in these psalms often correspond with the circumstances of the Redeemer's history in a very striking way. Did the divine Spirit guide the words and phrases, so that their adaptation to Christ should be at once recognised in after times? We dare not deny his operation; though the writers themselves had not the Messiah in their mind. The origin of the Messianic idea after the flourishing time of the Hebrew monarchy puts that period out of account as originating a Messianic psalm. The decaying age alone could have given it birth; and even that obscurely.

We are not disposed to deny the operation of the Divine Spirit in leading the authors to select poetical images that might be accommodated to the Saviour. A principal point to be kept in view is the *ideal nature* of poetical pictures sometimes given by these lyric writers. Moments of higher inspiration came over them, when they were transported in spirit to future times, and spake in glowing terms of scenes resplendent with earthly glory. Starting from the praises of a present monarch, they were wrapt in poetic vision, to paint the reign of some majestic one, to whom all the ends of the earth should do homage. These were to them but ideal scenes, the manifestation of far-reaching hopes and yearning desires engendered in minds of transcendent grasp. They were the swelling notes of a full-toned organ inspired by the breath of heaven, and giving forth unusual music, whose lingering tones melted away into the glorious future of a divine kingdom.

The second class, containing ii., xlv., lxxii., cx., which are supposed to describe the Messiah's power and majesty, make no allusion to Christ. Nor do they correspond to his character as set forth in the New Testament. As the writers give no hint of their alluding to one still future—to the great deliverer from sin and death—but speak of existing persons, it is arbitrary to apply

their language otherwise than naturally. How can worldly greatness, corporeal qualities, beauty, prowess, conquest, iron rule of enemies, marriage with a foreign princess, etc., which these odes pourtray, suit the meek and lowly Jesus of the gospels? The greatness, majesty, and power ascribed to him, are not the spiritual qualities of the *Christian*, whatever resemblance they bear to the *Jewish*, Messiah. A conqueror of nations wielding an iron sceptre, wearied with pursuing his flying enemies and drinking of the brook by the way to refresh himself in the hot haste of his chase, does not suit the New Testament conception of Christ. We know that a distinction has been made by theologians which helps to evade this obvious truth, viz., a *double headship of Christ*, one over the church; another over all things for the church. That is, two characters are attributed to the Messiah, in one of which he acts towards the church; in the other towards the world. The nations are treated in one way; believers in another. It is high time that such dogmatic distinctions, for which the Old Testament furnishes no authority, were laid aside. According to *the old economy*, Messiah was to treat the theocratic people in one way; heathen nations in another. The former He was to purify by judgments and then reign over the remnant in peace; the latter He was to treat in various ways, according to different prophets. The Jewish idea of Messiah is certainly unlike the Christian; because *the latter* regards him as equally loving and caring for all; the former as specially favourable to the theocratic people.

Of those who refer many other and even all psalms to Christ it is unnecessary to speak; since they appear to have no principle of interpretation but fancy or feeling. Their explanations are therefore curiosities; strange, monstrous, irrational, absurd. Yet they continue to be given, as if they were infallibly correct. Thus one says: "The Lord Jesus Christ, the true Israel, is the speaker in this (the 139th) psalm; and with him the new Israel that has sprung forth from him, his mystical body the Church," etc. Of course verses 13-16 pre-signify the literal body of Christ, and also his mystical body. They are prophetic of his incarnation and also of his Church. And besides, "this was *undoubtedly* the view taken of this psalm by the Apostle St. Paul," as shewn by the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹ If such extravagant, unbiblical allegorising does not revolt the good sense of the reader, any absurdity may be promulgated in the name of *interpretation*.

Bishop Horsley supposes that David's psalms were prophetic, because he describes himself and his sacred songs in this manner

¹ Thrupp's Introduction to the study and use of the Psalms, vol. ii. p. 294 et

at the close of his life: "David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet Psalmist of Israel said, the Spirit of Jehovah spake by me, and his word was in my tongue" (2 Sam. xxiii. 1, 2). "It was the word therefore of Jehovah's Spirit which was uttered by David's tongue. But it should seem the Spirit of Jehovah would not be wanted to enable a mere man to make complaint of his own enemies, to describe his own sufferings just as he felt them, and his own escapes just as they happened. But the Spirit of Jehovah described by David's utterance what was known to that Spirit only, and that Spirit only could describe. So that, if David be allowed to have had any knowledge of the true subject of his own compositions, it was nothing in his own life, but something put into his mind by the Holy Spirit of God: and the misapplication of the psalms to the literal David has done more mischief than the misapplication of any other parts of the Scriptures among those who profess the belief of the Christian religion."¹

We need scarcely say that this reasoning is radically wrong, because it proceeds from an imaginary interpretation of the phrases, "the Spirit of Jehovah spake by me," and "his word was in my tongue," which do not mean that whatever David wrote and spake was the direct suggestion or utterance of the Holy Spirit. The phraseology is general, signifying nothing more than that David was inspired. Whatever he wrote was by inspiration. He had the Spirit of God always. When he described his own sufferings he described them only. When he spoke of his enemies he meant them only. Hence we repudiate Horsley's assertion that the Psalms do not refer to the life of David: "there are none in which the son of David is not the principal and immediate subject. David's complaint against his enemies are Messiah's complaints, first of the unbelieving Jews, then of the heathen persecutors, and of the apostate faction in later ages. David's afflictions are Messiah's sufferings. David's penitential supplications are Messiah's, under the burden of the imputed guilt of man. David's songs of triumph and thanksgiving are Messiah's songs of triumph and thanksgiving for his victory over sin, and death, and hell." Doctrinal allegorising of this nature must be discarded. There are no direct prophecies of Christ in the Psalms. Whatever Messianic element is in them is *ideal* and therefore indefinite; the writers having no definite conceptions of his person. Accordingly we cannot adopt the opinion of Bishop Horne, that "the Psalms treat of the advent of Messiah

¹ Preface to Translation of Psalms, pp. xi., xii., Theolog. works, vol. iv.

with its effects and consequences ; his incarnation, birth, life, passion, death, resurrection, ascension, kingdom, and priesthood.”¹ Grammatico-historical interpretation rejects all this as arbitrary. It is the mere fancy of a Christian putting Christian doctrine into the Old Testament, where it is out of place. Judaism and Christianity should not be so blended. It is difficult, however, for one belonging to the later dispensation to throw himself back in idea into the times of the Old Testament writers, and to judge truly of their language.

XIII. DOCTRINE OF THE PSALMS RESPECTING A FUTURE STATE.
 —The sentiments uttered in the Psalms respecting a future state are essentially the same as those in the Pentateuch. Sheol or Orcus is the place to which the souls of the dead go, the vital spirit having returned to God from whom it emanated. There they have little if anything more to do with the body. In this vast subterranean and dark cavern the souls dwell, feeble and destitute of vigour, mere shades, without concern, feeling, or memory. Excluded from human affairs and the light of earth they do nothing. What is more, they are cut off from all intercourse with God, whom they can no longer praise or celebrate His wonders. Their time is passed in a kind of sleep, whence they are only roused by some uncommon occurrence. Thus they are represented as shut up in a land of forgetfulness—dreamy shades almost destitute of consciousness (comp. Ps. vi. 5, xxxix. 13, xlix. 19, lxiii. 9, lxxxviii., cxv. 17). The pious Israelites, therefore, as far as we see from this book, had not the belief of immortality. They did not entertain the sure hope of eternal life beyond the grave. They were deprived of the comfort derived from this faith ; and do not console themselves with it amid misfortunes.

A few passages, however, make it probable that some of the psalm-writers had at times a spark of hope that their fellowship with God might not be terminated by the present life. When they thought of the prosperity of the wicked in the world, and the misfortunes of the righteous, considering that such inequality often continued till death, they must have been perplexed. As they clung with firmness to Jehovah and valued communion with Him above all earthly good, it was natural that the idea of its indissolubility by death should arise within them. But we are not warranted in reasoning *a priori* on the point. The question must be decided by evidence. Do we ever find these poets uttering a hope or aspiration that their intercourse with Jehovah might continue for ever ? The following places bear on the question :

¹ Preface to Commentary on the Psalms.

Ps. xvi. 11 :

Thou wilt shew me the path of life,
 Fulness of joy before thy face,
 Pleasures at thy right hand for evermore.

Here the most probable interpretation is, that the pious speaker should not be given up as a prey to death but partake of everlasting communion with God. Conscious that he had already entered into intimate fellowship with Jehovah, who is his all-satisfying portion, he feels in the depths of his soul the anticipation of a blessed and immortal existence. It was probably a momentary consciousness that the bond which unites the believer to God can never be dissolved—a gleam of bold hope—a persuasion arising from the very bottom of his spirit, and welling up with unspeakable delight. He had no definite belief of entering on happiness immediately after death. *That* was not in his mind. Rather was it a powerful feeling, at the time, of never-ending union with God.

Psalm xlix. 15 :

But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave,
 For he shall receive me.

These words are opposed to those of the seventh verse, “None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him,” where death is spoken of. We must therefore understand the fifteenth verse of everlasting life with God. The Psalmist *hopes*, and anticipates in a moment of high spiritual feeling, that the state of the righteous enjoying God’s favour would be eternal. His soul bursting the limits of time stretches its pinions beyond the grave, conscious that the lot of the pious would not be that of the wicked shut up in Sheol, Not that such was a fixed belief. It was rather a feeling or consciousness excited and deepened by the contrast between the ungodly and righteous.

Psalm lxxiii. 23-26 :

Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel,
 And afterwards receive me to glory.
 Whom have I in heaven but thee?
 And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee.
 My flesh and my heart faileth;
 But God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever.

Here it is certain that the phrase “and afterwards receive me to glory” does not mean, that he should receive glory after death, but simply, “and will lead me to honour.” When the writer, however, proceeds to say, “though my heart and flesh be consumed, God is the rock of my heart and my portion for ever,” he feels himself so penetrated with a feeling of eternity that he is confident of never wanting the presence of a propitious God,

though his body should be destroyed. He thus rises to the height of immortality, boldly anticipating his eternal existence with Jehovah in full fruition of His favour. A realised present communion with Him becomes the earnest and pledge of its perpetuity.

Such are all the traces we have been able to discover of anticipations of a blessed and eternal life with God on the part of the pious. The prevailing belief did not recognise such rare burstings forth of a higher consciousness. Existence after death was to it a hopeless, comfortless state, from which the believer shrank: "In death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" (vi. 6) The higher hope of an ever-blessed life after death, never attained decided and definite expression. This is admitted by Delitzsch himself.

Some interpreters find allusions to a blessed life hereafter in Ps. xvii. 15, "As for me I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness." So De Wette, after J. H. Michaelis and others. The psalm was at first composed and used as an evening song or prayer; and *awaking* means *when I awake to-morrow*. De Wette, Delitzsch, and Hofmann argue that *awaking from the sleep of death* is intended; the last-named critic affirming that there is a contrast between בְּחַיִּים and בְּהִקְיָי.¹ The antithesis, however, is not between these two, but rather between *in life* and *satisfied with thy likeness* or its equivalent *seeing thy face in righteousness*. The word בְּהִקְיָי expresses a subordinate idea. The burden of the prayer is the enjoyment of the divine favour and protection *in this life*. Hence the previous petitions would have been superfluous, had the hope of future blessedness been enough, as is well observed by Hengstenberg.

The last verse of the forty-eighth psalm is also explained by some as containing the idea of a future state. "For this is our God for ever and ever: he will be our guide even unto death," or as some translate it *over death*, which is incorrect. The most obvious explanation is that which makes the phrase mean, *as long as we live*. The thought of the soul's immortality is foreign to the entire strain of the ode; and the present verse only declares the confident assurance of the writer that God would bring the nation out of severe perils. We do not agree with Burk, Stier, and Tholuck in finding the idea of a future state here.

We need not refer to Ps. xxxvii. 18, "The Lord knoweth the days of the upright: and their inheritance shall be for ever," because it is plain from the eleventh verse that the inheritance

¹ Der Schriftbeweis, vol. ii., zweite Abtheilung, p. 494 et seqq., second edition.

is not heavenly and everlasting, but earthly: "the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace."

XIV. ETHICS OF THE PSALTER.—With regard to the religious and moral dogmatic of the psalms, various opinions are entertained. Some suppose that the morality presented accords with the pure spirit of Christianity. Love to all men, forgiveness of enemies, mercy and benevolence, are inculcated in the same manner as in the gospel. This view is based on a certain theory of inspiration. Others think that universal charity and forgiveness of enemies were neither apprehended nor exemplified by the Jewish Psalmists as they were by the apostles and early Christians. The question turns upon the proper meaning of certain passages, where ill-wishes and curses appear to be uttered. The places are these:

Let the wicked be ashamed and let them be silent in the grave (xxx. 17).

Let them be confounded and put to shame that seek after my soul:
Let them be turned back and brought to confusion that devise my hurt.
Let them be as chaff before the wind:
And let the angel of the Lord chase them.
Let their way be dark and slippery:
And let the angel of the Lord persecute them (xxxv. 4-6).

Let destruction come upon him at unawares;
And let his net that he hath hid catch himself:
Into that very destruction let him fall (xxxv. 8).

Mine eye hath seen his desire upon mine enemies (liv. 8).

Destroy, O Lord, and divide their tongues:
For I have seen violence and strife in the city (lv. 9).

Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quick into hell;
For wickedness is in their dwellings and among them (lv. 15).

Thou therefore, O Lord God of hosts, the God of Israel, awake to visit all the heathen;
Be not merciful to any wicked transgressors (lix. 5).

Consume them in wrath, consume them that they may not be;
And let them know that God ruleth in Jacob, etc. (lix. 13).

Let their table become a snare before them:
And that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap.
Let their eyes be darkened that they see not;
And make their loins continually to shake.
Pour out thine indignation upon them,
And let thy wrathful anger take hold of them.
Let their habitation be desolate;
And let none dwell in their tents.
For they persecute him whom thou hast smitten;
And they talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded.
Add iniquity unto their iniquity;
And let them not come into thy righteousness.
Let them be blotted out of the book of the living,
And not be written with the righteous (lxix. 22-28).

Set thou a wicked man over him ;
 And let Satan stand at his right hand.
 When he shall be judged, let him be condemned ;
 And let his prayer become sin.
 Let his days be few,
 And let another take his office.
 Let his children be fatherless,
 And his wife a widow ;
 Let his children be continually vagabonds and beg :
 Let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places.
 Let the extortioner catch all that he hath ;
 And let the strangers spoil his labour.
 Let there be none to extend mercy unto him :
 Neither let there be any to favour his fatherless children.
 Let his posterity be cut off ;
 And in the generation following let their name be blotted out.
 Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with the Lord ;
 And let not the sin of his mother be blotted out.
 Let them be before the Lord continually, that he may cut off the memory of them
 from the earth
 As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him :
 As he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him.
 As he clothed himself with cursing as with his garment,
 So let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones.
 Let it be unto him as the garment which covereth him,
 And for a girdle wherewith he is girded continually.
 Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord,
 And of them that speak evil against my soul (cix. 6-20).

O daughter of Babylon who art to be destroyed,
 Happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us.
 Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones (cxxxvii. 8, 9).

Let burning coals fall upon them, let them be cast into the fire :
 Into deep pits, that they rise not up again (cxi. 10).

These are the chief places bearing on the point in question.
 Let us see how they are explained.

1. Some affirm that the language is not that of *prayer* or *wish*, but *prediction*. It is alleged that the imperative mood is often used for the future, and is so here. We hold it unphilosophical to say that the imperative and future are interchangeable. They agree so far as that both are *voluntative*, to use the term of Ewald.¹ Both express conditions of the will. The imperative, however, is the highest utterance of the will, its shortest and most decided expression. The future again is a less emphatic manifestation of it. This characteristic difference may be modified by abbreviation and enlargement ; but it is never lost sight of entirely. The choice is regulated to a great extent by the feelings of the writer at the time. If the feelings are very strong, the imperative is employed ; if they are weaker, the future will be used. The imperatives in these imprecations can only be referred to the writers' desires, shewing what they are. *Proper predictions* are never made by imperatives.

¹ Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Heb. Sprache, p. 426, fifth edition.

The future tense performs that office. Thus Hebrew grammar contradicts the offered explanation. If it did not, other arguments are sufficient to overthrow it.

2. The poets' enemies were the enemies of God, rebels to the heavenly King and violators of his commands. To desire their punishment arose, it may be presumed, not from a vindictive feeling, but from a regard to religion. It was in fact tantamount to desiring the Almighty to vindicate His glory by inflicting the chastisement they deserved. Considering their numbers and persevering malignity, the escape of the writer might seem utterly impracticable without their entire overthrow. Hence a prayer for their destruction was equivalent to a prayer for his own preservation.

How this view justifies the use of such prayers we are unable to see. It is totally insufficient. Supposing that the poets' enemies were the enemies of God, how is their spirit justified thereby? In the very same sense, it may now be said that the enemies of a good man are the enemies of God. But does that circumstance justify the good man in praying for their destruction? The enemies of Christ, who is humanity's highest pattern, were also God's enemies; yet, instead of calling down punishment on their heads, he prayed for their forgiveness. We cannot tell whether the desire of their enemies being punished arose from a regard to religion, or from vindictive feelings. *The motives* of the speakers can only be discovered from *their language*. And that language certainly leads to the conclusion that the feelings were more vindictive than religious. Thus in the 137th psalm, "Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones," we may ask, was this prompted by a regard to religion? Surely not. "Be not merciful to any wicked transgressors." Was such a prayer inspired by religion? We think not. Man is not justified in desiring the Almighty to vindicate his glory by inflicting deserved chastisements, especially such chastisements as the eternal destruction of enemies. "Consume them in wrath, consume them that they may not be," has no warrant in the New Testament. We have nothing to do with calling upon or reminding the Almighty to vindicate His glory. *But we have to pray for our enemies*, because Christ expressly commands it. And suppose the escape of a writer might seem utterly impracticable without the entire overthrow of foes, does that justify a prayer for their destruction? By no means. As long as we have faith in God, it should effectually repress all the feelings that prompt to pray for the destruction of enemies, even though our own preservation be promoted thereby. "Dearly beloved," says the apostle, "avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto

wrath. For it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." *That* is the Christian spirit. What kind of morality is it which prays that enemies may not be pardoned; that they may be "blotted out of the book of the living and not be written with the righteous" *i.e.*, effaced from the divine decree, as Alexander¹ explains it? Secret things belong unto the Lord. What has man to do with the divine decrees?

The explanation offered of these imprecatory psalms utterly fails, in whatever light it be regarded. It does not apply to all. If words are to be taken as they stand, the speakers cannot be cleared of the charge of having vindictive feelings.

Set thou a wicked man over him,
 And let Satan stand at his right hand :
 When he shall be judged, let him be condemned,
 And let his prayer become sin.
 Let his days be few, and let another take his office ;
 Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow ;
 Let his children be continually vagabonds and beg.
 Let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places.
 Let there be none to extend mercy unto him ;
 Neither let there be any to favour his fatherless children.
 Let his posterity be cut off,
 And in the generation following let their name be blotted out.
 Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with the Lord,
 And let not the sin of his mother be blotted out (cix.)

There can be no question that a real individual is here meant, not an ideal person. Some one is singled out as the subject of imprecation. And not only is the prayer against himself, but also against his children, his posterity also generally. The very iniquity of the fathers of the individuals is introduced, with the view of its being remembered against the descendant; and it is requested that his *mother's* sin should not be blotted out. Have the children, mother, ancestors of the person, anything to do with his own deeds? The sufferer prays directly and plainly for the punishment of an enemy. He launches forth dire imprecations against him; wishing that the innocent children, and even the parents, might be visited and not forgiven. If this be not evidence of vindictive feelings, we know not what vindictiveness is. The man himself may have been the Psalmist's persevering, malignant enemy; but how could the children, the posterity, the ancestors, be so? The thing is impossible.

It is truly marvellous how any writer on the psalm could say, "there is nought in it which may not be piously uttered by every worshipper, whether under the Old or under the New Covenant, who is filled with a holy jealousy for God's honour." Holy jealousy truly! Rather *unholy* and *unchristian*, alien to *piety*, though not to so-called orthodoxy. From *such* jealousy we

¹ The Psalms translated and explained, vol. ii. p. 131.

pray to be delivered. In like manner, some apologetic authors speak of *vengeful expressions* as being sometimes the expressions of enlightened zeal for God's glory, when they come from an inspired man! But there is no distinction in their *essence* or *morality*, whether they proceed from a private individual or an inspired David. Inspiration does not alter their character, because right and wrong are unchangeable. All reasoning to excuse these imprecations on the ground of God's justice and righteous indignation against sin is radically unsound, as long as God and man are so separate that the latter cannot arrogate to himself the true attributes of the Former. Besides, there is no proper analogy, because the objectionable psalm-passages are *prayers* or *wishes*. Is this parallel to statements that Jehovah will punish sin, destroy the wicked, etc., or that he hates sin?

Again, when the psalmist prays,

Add iniquity unto their iniquity,
And let them not come into thy righteousness (Ixix. 27),

the prayer asks, that sin may be followed by the natural effects of sin, and that pardon may not be extended. What situation of the speaker could justify him in supposing that their not being pardoned was a necessary condition of his escape from them? None whatever, according to the New Testament. No regard to religion or hatred of iniquity, could prompt such a petition. It is essentially irreligious. That the bitterest curses of this 109th psalm are the psalmist's own we hold all but certain; though Michaelis, Knapp, R. Williams, and others put verses six to nineteen into the mouth of his adversary, apparently because *one* person is always spoken of in them, and *more than one* in the preceding context. The change of number however is a common thing, and the plural returns in the fifteenth verse.

Attempts have been made to represent the psalmists in these cases as the *types* and *representatives* of Messiah. How this improves the matter we cannot see. It makes the case worse. Does everything that a type of the Messiah says or writes, bear the stamp of the truly religious on that account? Certainly not, else he were infallible; which no mere man can be. This typical hypothesis is arbitrary and baseless. It is unpsychological too; for what meaning is there in saying with Delitzsch, that "persecution of David was a sinning not merely against David himself, but against Christ in him; and because Christ is in David, the wrath of Christ against his future foes mingles with the psalmist's wrath against his present enemies?"¹

3. A recent writer on the psalms offers this explanation: "As-

¹ Commentar, vol. ii. p. 130.

suming as a fact beyond dispute, that the mass of the wicked will, as a *whole*, never be separated from their sins; assuming that the defilement of sin must be eternally perpetuated unless God at last interpose to overthrow those who wilfully and resolutely prefer darkness to light; the believer is forced for the honour of God, to pray for the latter alternative, and to acquiesce in the judgments which he foresees that the impenitent will inevitably bring on their own heads. We pray for the punishment of the wicked on the assumption of their impenitence, not for the punishment of such as may repent; and prayer of this kind is virtually involved in the petition which our Saviour taught us, 'Thy kingdom come.'"¹

A weaker and more unchristian explanation could not be offered. According to it the inspired writer, or David, (as he thinks), *assumes* that the mass of the wicked will for ever remain impenitent; on which assumption he prays that God's judgments may fall heavily on their heads. The believer makes an *assumption* altogether unwarranted; and on the strength of it prays for the punishment of the wicked. We hold it utterly unchristian *to make* such an assumption. A believer has no warrant for it. Scripture does not authorise him. The known character of God does not authorise him. Christian charity does not authorise him. On the contrary, all these expressly dissuade from it. The apostle Paul exhorts that prayers and intercessions be made for *all* men; for God our Saviour will have *all* men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth (1 Tim. ii. 1, etc.); but this theologian justifies the believer in praying, *on the bare assumption that the mass of men will be for ever impenitent*, that their wickedness may be punished and their persons destroyed. He even justifies the language of the Psalmist, "Add iniquity unto their iniquity; and let them not come into thy righteousness."

Well has it been said by Poole, that "these imprecations (in the sixty-ninth psalm) are so many and so severe that they may seem to exceed the bounds of justice and charity, if they be applied to David's enemies as a recompence for their injuries done to him;" but most incorrectly does he add, that they "most deservedly and fitly belong to the enemies and murderers of Christ."² Christ prayed for his murderers that they might be forgiven: how can David or any other be right in praying the opposite? The example of Christ should not be despised. How can an Old Testament believer be excusable in uttering imprecations against the enemies of Christ in the

¹ Introduction to the study and use of the Psalms, by J. F. Thrupp, M.A., vol. i. p. 384.

² Annotations on the Bible.

future; when Christ himself manifested a spirit directly the reverse?

4. Prof. B. B. Edwards has given another explanation, whose substance appears in this form:¹ "Only a morbid benevolence, a mistaken philanthropy, takes offence at these psalms; for in reality they are not opposed to the spirit of the gospel, or to that love of enemies which Christ enjoined. Resentment against evil doers is so far from being sinful, that we find it exemplified in the meek and spotless Redeemer himself (Mark. iii. 5). If the emotion and its utterance were essentially sinful (1 Cor. xvi. 22) how could Paul wish the enemy of Christ to be accursed (*ἀνάθεμα*), or say of his own enemy Alexander the coppersmith, 'The Lord reward him according to his works' (2 Tim. iv. 14); and especially, how could the spirits of the just in heaven call on God for vengeance? (Rev. vi. 10)."

This explanation is derived from Hengstenberg, and, however plausible, must be rejected. Let us consider the particulars referred to in it. We read of Jesus in Mark iii. 5, "When he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts," etc. Here anger and grief are attributed to the Redeemer. But there is neither prayer nor wish. The feelings in question are wholly unlike those which prompted the words, "Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold upon them. Add iniquity unto their iniquity, and let them not come into thy righteousness," etc. (Ps. lxi.). Resentment against persevering evil doers is different from malediction and imprecation. The Saviour's pure and spotless mind was entirely free from the latter, as we see by the prayer he taught his disciples, and by his whole conduct. Suppose the explanation of 1 Cor. xvi. 22 which is adopted, and the correctness of the optative reading in 2 Tim. iv. 14, we cannot identify the spirit of the gospel or the love of enemies enjoined by Christ, with the occasional utterances of any Christian whether he be an apostle or no. The individuality of inspired persons is not destroyed by their inspiration. But indeed there is no vindictiveness in the expressions of Paul comparable to those we have quoted. Lachmann and Griesbach read the future in 2 Tim. iv. 14 and 1 Cor. xvi. 22; the wish expressed "let him be anathema-maranatha" is not to be pressed as if it were anything more than a strong expression of his own love to Christ, impatient that others should not equally love him.

The highly poetical language in Rev. vi. 10 should not be brought into comparison with the imprecations before us. The

¹ By a writer in Kitto's Cyclopædia, who adopts it. See the original article in the Bibliotheca Sacra for 1844, p. 97, et seqq.

Apocalyptist intended to set forth the idea that the guilt of those who persecute the saints is very great. It would almost seem as if the happiness of the martyrs' spirits were incomplete till they see their desire on their enemies. The mode of expressing the idea is a mere *symbol*. The writer represents the slain as crying for vengeance, in order to set forth the enormity of the guilt incurred by their murderers. The contrast heightens the picture. The language is peculiar and unique, unlike that of the Psalmists.

The hypothesis is untenable, because unsupported by the New Testament analogies adduced for its support. The essence of Christianity is, "Do unto others as you would wish them to do unto you." "Love your enemies, pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." Nor are Hengstenberg's additional analogies any better. The woes pronounced upon Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum (Matt. xi. 20, etc.); the woes uttered against the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii.); the words of Peter to Simon Magus, "thy money perish with thee" (Acts viii. 20); and Paul's exclamation to the high-priest, "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall" (Acts xxiii. 3), are not proper analogies. They are neither prayers for vengeance, nor ill-wishes. They are *simple declarations*.

In explaining the imprecations before us we should recollect, First, That they are clothed in the language of poetry. They may therefore have received something of their form from the desire of poetic effect. They belong to the impassioned, exaggerated, diction of poetry, which bodies forth conceptions with vehemence and rhetorical elevation. These remarks apply particularly to the 109th psalm, where the writer heaps up words in excess, in imitation of prior authors, apparently without attaching much meaning to them, or throwing real feeling into their nature. The accumulation bears an artificial character which betrays the lateness of the writer.

Secondly. After an attentive examination, we cannot find any good evidence for assigning the authorship to David. Delitzsch in attributing the 109th to him, simply *asserts* the thing.¹ In our opinion the best critics coincide; Ewald, De Wette, Hitzig, Hupfeld, Olshausen. It is less likely, therefore, that they were composed in a state of war—a crisis in which prayer for the destruction of enemies might be deemed equivalent to prayer for preservation and success; for harshness is common to warfare. War does not alter the relations of right and wrong. Holding then, as we do, the irreligious character of these prayers and wishes against enemies, we do not approve of their

¹ Commentar, vol. ii. p. 130.

use either in war or peace. They are evidently improper in the case of private christians with respect to personal enemies.

On the whole, extenuate such language as we may, the precepts and spirit of Christ repudiate such imprecations of enemies, be they private or public ones. A simple reader of the Bible sees in them some ebullition of natural and unsanctified feeling which Judaism itself was meant to subdue, but often failed to accomplish because of its outward character. Nor is it strange that persons whose *conduct* was not uniformly correct, should have occasionally uttered language of corresponding character. It is quite conceivable that under circumstances of exasperation and ingratitude, holy men should sometimes express personal feelings inconsistent with their prevailing temper and the spirit of true religion. "If now," says Tholuck, "the question be proposed, whether we are necessarily led to adopt the conclusion that the unholy fire of personal anger never in any case mingled with the fire of the Psalmist, in itself holy, we dare not assert this even of the holy apostles. Whether the wrath be such, in excited speech, as is not right before God, or such as that with which even Christ kindled, may be commonly perceived from the nature of it, viz., when satisfaction with the idea of even daring to be an instrument of the divine retribution is visible; or when special kinds of retribution are prayed for with evident satisfaction; or when it is perceptible that the representation of them is joined with delight on the part of the speaker, etc. In Psalms cix. and lix. particularly many expressions have a passionate character. In like manner cxlix. 7, 8; cxxxvii. 8, 9; lviii. 11; xli. 11, may have arisen from similar feeling. About others, individual feeling will decide differently."¹ This is calmly and judiciously stated.

On the other hand, Hengstenberg affirms that the position assigned by our Lord and his apostles to the Psalms refutes the idea, that the unholy fire of personal irritation mingles with the holy fire of the Psalmists. They are treated as a portion of the Word of God; and it is precisely the most severe of the so-called vindictive psalms which are applied to Christ and considered as spoken by him, and therefore pronounced worthy of him (xli.; lxix.; cix.).² Let us examine these statements:

Our Lord and his apostles recognised the book of Psalms as a portion of the Scriptures in which the Word of God is undoubtedly contained. But we nowhere find them sanctioning the idea that all the psalms, with every verse in them, are *the*

¹ Uebersetzung und Auslegung der Psalmen, pp. lxiii., lxiv.

² Commentary translated, vol. iii. p. lxxiii.

Word of God. Thus two things are confounded; *the Scripture*, and *the Word of God*.

Again, we deny the truth of the assertion that the vindictive psalms are regarded as spoken by Christ and therefore worthy of him. The words of the forty-first psalm, "Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, hath lifted up his heel against me," are quoted in John's Gospel (xiii. 18) and there applied by our Lord to himself and Judas, *by accommodation*. This circumstance, however, does not prove the Messianic nature of the psalm generally, whose direct and exclusively Messianic interpretation is abandoned by Hengstenberg himself. David, according to him, speaks as the representative of the whole class of righteous sufferers, to which class Christ belongs, as its most illustrious member. We believe that the ode refers to a righteous sufferer who complains of the cruelty of cunning enemies and false friends; and prays for help together with restoration. It is by no means certain that David was the writer. De Wette and Ewald think he was not. Even if he were, it is psychologically impossible that he personates another. The contents do not correspond to Christ, for we read, "heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee" (verse 4); and "raise me up that I may requite them" (verse 10). Such language is obviously inapplicable to the pure and perfect Jesus.

From the sixty-ninth psalm are cited, "for the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me," in John ii. 17; "they that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of mine head" in John xv. 25; "they gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink," in John xix. 29; "Let their habitation be desolate and let none dwell in their tents" in Acts i. 20; all applied to Christ. The psalm is not David's. Some righteous sufferer living in the time of the Babylonish captivity speaks. It is not Messianic. The passages quoted are *accommodated* to the Messiah. The fifth verse makes a confession of foolishness and sin, shewing that there is no reference to Christ. And it is inconsistent with his disposition that he should utter the wish in the twenty-fifth verse, which Peter applies to the case of Judas.

From the 109th psalm, part of the eighth verse is quoted by the apostle Peter and applied to the case of Judas (Acts i. 20). But all that the citation implies is, that the words *suit the situation* of the traitor. They are accommodated to him. The psalm was not written by David. It is not Messianic. The Saviour is not the speaker in it. How could Jesus utter such curses? It is blasphemy to say so.

These remarks will enable the reader to see that Hengsten-

berg's assertion of the so-called vindictive psalms being considered as spoken by Christ, is baseless. In no instance does he utter the words of the three psalms in question, nor indeed of any other. He is neither *directly* nor *indirectly* the speaker.

It is equally erroneous in the same critic to say, that "in the psalms we have before us not the aimless and inconsiderate expression of subjective feelings, but they were from the first destined for use in the sanctuary; and the sacred authors come forth under the full consciousness of being interpreters of the spiritual feelings of the community, organs of God for the ennobling of their feelings. They give back what in the holiest and purest hours of their life had been given to them." This is mere assumption. Where is the evidence that the psalmists come forth under the full consciousness of being organs of God? Does he who wrote, "preserve my soul, for I am holy?" Or does the author of, "The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness; according to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me: for I have kept the ways of the Lord, and have not wickedly departed from my God: for all his judgments were before me, and I did not put away his statutes from me: I was also upright before him, and I kept myself from mine iniquity. *Therefore* hath the Lord recompensed me according to my righteousness, according to the cleanness of my hands in his eyesight?"—does either of these writers stand forth in the consciousness of being an organ of God for ennobling the feelings of the community? Surely not. The man who prayed against another, "let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow;" was *he* an organ of God in uttering such an imprecation? The psalmist who says of Babylon, "happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones;" did *he* ennoble the feelings of the community? Rather did he debase them by such an utterance. We do not believe, moreover, that all the psalms were originally destined for use in the sanctuary. The five books arose out of private collections, proving the contrary.

The system of morality which allowed of these maledictions was incomplete. It was in harmony with the entire character of the Jewish system—a system adapted to a low state of spiritual culture. The expressions in question cannot be agreeable to the divine will. If the command of the Saviour to love and pray for enemies, as well as his lofty example, be right and proper, the expressions in question cannot be agreeable to the divine will. These Jewish writers had not learned forgiveness of enemies as Jesus taught it. His lesson to forgive, as sinners hope to be forgiven, is not exemplified by them. Revenge was not condemned by the semi-barbarous spirit of antiquity. It

arose out of that spirit. But universal love and forgiveness of injuries are opposed to it. If inspiration does not exclude individuality, or suppress the exercise of the human faculties, a revengeful sentiment may be uttered by one inspired. Inspiration has degrees. Hence it necessarily partakes of incompleteness. And because inspired men are not made perfectly holy and pure, either in thought or deed—because they are still *men* and not *God*, they *may* and *do* express what is imperfect as well as incomplete. The curses in question are opposed to the command of the Saviour, if language have any natural meaning. Many persons do not distinguish between the divine Spirit as *He is in himself*, omniscient, infinite, perfectly holy, and *as he is in his operation upon men*. In the latter case, he does not appear in his pure divinity, but unites with the human spirit, penetrating and enlightening it. He does not abide, so to speak, by the side of the human spirit, in his independent existence, and influence it thence; so that a twofold consciousness arises, viz., that of the divine, and that of the human spirit. Both mingle together in one consciousness. Accordingly the ideas, feelings, and words are an emanation, not of the Holy Spirit as he is in himself, but indirectly. Or rather, they are the product of minds pervaded and enlightened, in a certain degree, by the spirit of God. They are the expression of the God-consciousness in man, developed according to the age and circumstances of the writers.¹ Even in the prophets, who refer expressly to *the word of the Lord*, and represent themselves as interpreters of the divine will, the *personal* and *individual* appears; much more does it appear in the psalmists, who bore no public, official character. Had the souls of the writers been purified from *every* human passion and feeling, the Holy Spirit must have lifted them up out of humanity to make them more than men—an idea which their own language contradicts. By their *words* we must be guided. The truth-loving reader must take the utterances *as they are*, not as men twist them for the sake of a theory. His leading principle is historical interpretation, which he follows out honestly and consistently to its legitimate conclusions.

If these observations be correct, Hengstenberg's view of the Old Testament-teaching, respecting the spirit of love, is incorrect. He argues that the spirit of placability was as prevalent and powerful under the Old as under the New Dispensation. What are his proofs? they are these: the emphatic declarations of the law against revenge (Lev. xix. 18; Ex. xxiii. 4, 5). The

¹ See De Wette's Ueber die erbauliche Erklärung der Psalmen, p. 11 et seqq. and Bleek, Ueber die Stellung der Apokryphen, reprinted from the Studien und Kritiken, pp. 46, 47.

strongest and most numerous passages against revenge are to be found in the Old Testament; and Paul borrows the words of the Old in Rom. xii. 19, 20: compare also the following, Prov. xxv. 21, xx. 22, xxiv. 17, xviii. 29; Job xxxi. These proofs are overbalanced by others weightier and more numerous in the Old Testament, as Ps. xviii. 37-43, liv. 5, xcii. 11, xciv. 2, cxxxvii. 8; Jer. xi. 20, xv. 15, xx. 12, l. 15; Lam. i. 21-22, iii. 64. The very nature of Judaism—an incomplete, local, limited dispensation—led the Israelites to entertain feelings towards others which were alien to the genius of Christianity. The severe laws against the seven nations inhabiting Judea had an indirect tendency to make the Jews hate all their enemies. They thought it right to look upon all who were not of themselves as outcasts from the favour of Jehovah. Because they were commanded to love their neighbour, *i.e.*, a *brother Jew* (Lev. xix. 18), they inferred that the reverse should also be practised, *Thou shalt hate thine enemy*. They were commanded to have no intercourse with the heathen. Hence their narrow prejudices, their haughty bearing, their hostility to all who were not of their nation. The passages which speak against revenge in the Old Testament relate for the most part to the intercourse of Jew with Jew; while similar passages in the New breathe expansive benevolence towards *all peoples*. The Jewish religion was one of particularism. It was unfavourable to the exercise of love to all mankind—especially to heathen enemies.

The error of those who try to put the Old Testament on the same level as the New in relation to its spirit, seems to arise from inadequate ideas of what a *revelation* is. They look upon it as something coming directly from God—doctrines, precepts, and laws emanating *immediately* from the infinitely holy One. This is a mistake. The Old Testament dispensation is divine because it is human—the expression of human consciousness inspired by the divine according to the stage to which humanity, or the best portion of it, had advanced at the time.

There is no doubt that God tolerated revenge in certain cases under the Old Testament as, “an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth” (Ex. xxi. 24). The relations of a man who had been killed might also take vengeance on the murderer (Num. xxxv. 16-18). These things, however, are absolutely forbidden under the New Testament. Where is there a command in all the Jewish Scriptures like that which shines forth in the beauty and glory of Him who gave it, “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you” (Matt. v. 44)?

"Some of them (the psalms)," says Dr. Isaac Watts, "are almost opposite to the spirit of the Gospel; many of them foreign to the state of the New Testament, and widely different from the present circumstances of Christians. Hence it comes to pass that when spiritual affections are excited within us, and our souls are raised a little above this earth in the beginning of a psalm, we are checked on a sudden in our ascent toward heaven, by some expressions that are most suited to the days of *carnal ordinances*, and fit only to be sung in the *worldly sanctuary*. . . . While we are kindling into divine love by the meditations of the *loving-kindness of God and the multitude of his tender mercies*, within a few verses *some dreadful curse against man is proposed to our lips*; that *God would add iniquity unto their iniquity, nor let them come into his righteousness, but blot them out of the book of the living* (Ps. lxi. 26-28), which is so contrary to the new commandment of *loving our enemies*; and even under the Old Testament, is best accounted for by referring it to the spirit of prophetic vengeance."¹ "Ps. lxi. 8, and cix. are so full of cursings," says the same writer, "that they hardly become a follower of the blessed Jesus, who, dying, prayed for his enemies, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do."² Baxter employs language still more explicit—"David fills most of his psalms with such complaints of his enemies, and curses against them, as shew a far greater sense of the sufferings of the flesh and the concerns of this life than Peter and Paul shewed, who suffered far more, and for a holier cause, and rejoiced in tribulation, *and than is suitable either to the precepts or example of Christ*."³ It would be well for persons who are fond of claiming kindred with the Puritans, and of calling themselves Nonconformists, if they had the sense and liberality of Baxter. "How far it may be proper," says Dr. Durell, "to continue the reading of these psalms in the daily service of our church, I leave to the consideration of the legislature to determine. A Christian of erudition may consider those imprecations only as the natural sentiments of Jews, which the benign religion he professes abhors and condemns; but what are the illiterate to do, who know not where to draw the line between the law and the gospel? They hear both read, one after the other; and I fear too often think them both of equal obligation; and even take shelter under Scripture to cover their curses. Though I am conscious I here tread upon slippery ground, I will take leave to hint, that, notwithstanding the high antiquity that sanctifies as it were this practice, it

¹ Preface to Hymns and Spiritual Songs.

² Essay toward the improvement of Psalmody.

³ Paraphrase of the New Testament, Preface.

would, in the opinion of a number of wise and good men, be more for the credit of the Christian church to omit a few of those psalms, and to substitute some parts of the gospel in their stead.¹ "It is not David's fault," says Munk,² "if his very songs of war have become songs of the church. It is the fault of those who think it a part of religion to uphold the infallibility of Hebrew records and the adaptation of all their contents to edify Christians."

In connexion with the ethics of the psalter it should also be noticed, that the writers sometimes express too great confidence in their moral rectitude. A pride of self-righteousness is occasionally observable when they speak of themselves. This shews that they had neither adequate conceptions of sin, nor of themselves as related to God. Thus we read: "thou hast proved mine heart; thou hast visited me in the night: thou hast tried me and shalt find nothing; I am purposed that my mouth shall not transgress" (xvii. 3). The poet in this passage fears no searching of the Trier of reins and heart, because he is conscious of his innocence. "Judge me, O Lord; for I have walked in mine integrity: I have trusted also in the Lord; therefore I shall not slide. Examine me, O Lord, and prove me; try my reins and my heart. For thy loving-kindness is before mine eyes: and I have walked in thy truth. I have not sat with vain persons, neither will I go in with dissemblers. I have hated the congregation of evil-doers; and will not sit with the wicked. I will wash mine hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar, O Lord: that I may publish with the voice of thanksgiving, and tell of all thy wondrous works" (xxvi. 1-7). "Our heart is not turned back, neither have our steps declined from thy way" (xliv. 18). "I will behave myself wisely in a perfect way. O when wilt thou come unto me. I will walk within my house with a perfect heart" (ci. 2). "I have remembered thy name, O Lord, in the night, and have kept thy law. This I had, because I kept thy precepts" (cxix. 55-56). "I understand more than the ancients, because I keep thy precepts. I have refrained my feet from every evil way, that I might keep thy word. I have not departed from thy judgments," etc. (cxix. 100-102). "I have sworn and I will perform it, that I will keep thy righteous judgments" (cxix. 106). "I have inclined mine heart to perform thy statutes alway, even unto the end" (cxix. 112). "I have kept thy precepts and thy testimonies: for all my ways are before thee" (cxix. 168). "Search me, O God, and know my heart, try me and know my thoughts: and see if there be any wicked way in me," etc. etc. (cxxxix. 23). "Preserve

¹ Critical remarks on the books of Job, Proverbs, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, p. 180.

² Palestine, p. 284.

my soul, for I am *holy*" (lxxxvi. 2). Here the poet's holiness is adduced as an argument to move God to hear his prayers. Even Delitzsch admits in this last passage, that the pious petitioner asks the help of God "not merely because he needs it, but because he is united to Him in trustingness of spirit, and therefore not undeserving of aid."¹

Judaical Christianity has still a strong hold on many. Our popular theology is largely imbued with it. Many persons, in a half-unconscious way, place the Old Testament on the same level with the New, and try all possible methods of harmonising some sentiments in both which are plainly different. They are desirous to uphold the ethics of the one as if they were equal in purity to those of the other. Ignorant that the one occupies a certain stage in the development of man's ideas respecting God and of God's communications to man, they transfer it to the place and time of the later dispensation by attaching equal weight to its contents. This is doing grievous injustice to Christianity—withholding from it its due platform of elevation. Judaism was an incomplete system, preparatory to something better. And not only was it incomplete but imperfect. In saying this we do not convey the impression that it is useless now. It is still profitable to Christians—conducive to their instruction and admonition because of the historical ground it gives to piety in all situations of life. As it supplied an indispensable basis for the New Testament, there is an essential element of union between them. The Old is to the New as the bud to the flower. Christ himself is in the Old inasmuch as it exhibits general truths on which he based his doctrine, as well as prophecies and types of him. Yet the old includes views, feelings, strivings, that either fall short of, or are adverse to, the New. Hebraism exhibits the *particular* and the *universal*. The latter alone has relation to the edification of Christians. Those who have studied its nature are aware that it contains not merely the *revelation* which Moses communicated to his generation—the conceptions of a clear God-consciousness in his soul—but the *peculiar* which evolves itself out of the theocracy and goes beyond it; such as the doctrine of *self-consecration* arising out of sacrifices, and the Messianic element, whose central idea is future completeness. Inspiration was not possessed by the men who lived under Judaism in the measure enjoyed by the New Testament writers, for it was necessarily moulded by the stage of advancement to which their age had attained. Judaism echoed in part *the spirit of that age*. Hence it was marked with some of the imperfections adhering to the sentiments and prac-

¹ Vol. i. p. 647.

tices of the time. Human infirmity enters very perceptibly into it, though the basis consists of a few pure and glorious truths, without which it could neither be a proper *revelation* nor Christianity itself apprehended and experienced, because they are the substratum of all that is distinctive in its doctrines. *The gospel of Christ* is the Christian's *standard*; not the Old Testament economy. Tried by the former, the latter is meagre and unsatisfactory as an ethical and religious system. Each, however, has the marks of wise adaptation to the purposes which the great God intended by it. In the development and restoration of humanity their position is exactly appropriate.

XV. HOW THE BOOK SPEAKS OF SACRIFICE.—In relation to sacrifice, the book of Psalms *generally* speaks of it as something in which God does not take delight. It is represented as an outward shell or form of no value. Thus we read: "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required" (xl. 6); "I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he goats out of thy folds. For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains: and the wild beasts of the field are mine. If I were hungry I would not tell thee: for the world is mine and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?" (l. 9-13). In place of sacrifice the writers put contrition of heart, prayer, thankfulness, devotion to Jehovah in doing his will. Hence sacrifice is not viewed as a *type*, in relation to the future atonement of Messiah; but is simply a *symbol*. It is considered *ethically*, not in connection with the plan of salvation by Jesus Christ. It is a gift to God without being presented as propitiatory; *the outward symbol* of moral qualities in the person who offers it. Thus the Psalms get beyond the narrower limits of the Mosaic ritual, and overleap "the rudiments of the world" by holding forth the characteristic emotions as far more precious in the sight of God than outward ceremonies and bloody offerings.

Hofmann himself admits, that the sufferings of Christ are not predicted in the Old Testament till the latter part of Isaiah, in which the *servant of God* is described. He abandons Gen. iii. 15; Is. vii. 15; xi. 1; Ps. xxii. and lxix.; Amos ix. 11; Zech. ix. 9. Well may he do so, for criticism shews their unsuitableness to the sufferings and self-sacrifice of Jesus.¹

XVI. THE POETRY OFTEN CONVERTED INTO PROSE.—A very common mistake consists in understanding the poetry of the Psalms as prose; by which means doctrines are evolved and

¹ Der Schriftbeweis, vol. ii, zweite Abtheilung, p. 187 et seqq.

sentiments inculcated that were never intended by the writers. The language of poetry, and especially of oriental poetry, is highly coloured, hyperbolic, exaggerated. The figures are bold and daring. Passion and feeling predominate. In the Psalms pre-eminently, we see the theology of the feelings rather than of the intellect. Logic is out of place there. Dogma cannot be established on such a basis; nor was it ever meant to be so. When the feelings of the poet are highly excited, he expresses himself in language of corresponding strength and intensity, not in measured terms. Obeying the impulses of his imagination, he bodies forth his conceptions in hyperbolic strains. Aspirations and hopes are expressed, which are only the vague longings of a spirit reaching forward to a definite and desirable consummation. The same remark naturally applies to the prophets; especially when we consider it probable that prophets wrote various psalms, as well as the writings that bear their name. The figures and fictions of poetry must not be judged by the rules of dogmatic theologians intent on their system of divinity rather than the natural utterances of Hebrew bards. Hence the attempts of theologians to shew what they call "the missionary spirit" of the psalms and prophets, is futile. It is contrary to their genius to metamorphose ideal hopes uttered from the fullness of a spiritual mind, into *fixed beliefs*. They should be left in the shadowy region to which they belong—in the domain of imagination, feeling, hope, longing, where is their true home. As an example of this, take the words of the Psalmist, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me," words which have been converted into a *locus classicus* in reference to the doctrine of original sin; whereas they are nothing more than a hyperbolic expression of the author's feelings respecting his sinfulness. Literal prose they are not; nor should they be converted into it. They are an exaggerated utterance of the speaker, intended to convey a very vivid idea of his moral corruption. Not contented with saying that the seeds of sin were in his nature from a very early period or from birth, he goes farther back and affirms that his mother conceived him in sin! To take such language otherwise than the theology of feelings strongly excited—the theology of Oriental poetry—is to misapprehend it most grievously. Yet the manufacturers of theological systems *will* quote it as the calm dictum of David speaking by an infallible and verbal inspiration!

Similar observations apply to psalm xiv. 1-3.

The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God;
They are corrupt, they have done abominable works,
There is none that doeth good.

The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men,
 To see if there were any that did understand and seek God.
 They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy;
 There is none that doeth good, no, not one.

Here it is to be observed that the psalmist probably lived during the exile, as the last verse shews; that he speaks of his contemporaries and the oppressors of his people; of their actual sins, not of original corruption; of a class of men who were exceedingly depraved in their doings; that the phrase "children of men" is not in itself a designation of the godless contrasted with the pious; that the fool (ver. 1) is an epithet given to a peculiar class; and that there is a poetical hyperbole in the third verse, the expression of a strong feeling respecting the mass being morally corrupt (there is none that doeth good, no, not one), which should not be taken for more than a figure of rhetoric; as the immediate mention of a *righteous generation* and the *poor whose refuge is the Lord*, sufficiently shews. The poet complains to God of the wickedness of the men of his time, especially His people's oppressors. All appears to him morally corrupt. He represents God himself as surveying with judicial eye from his heavenly throne, the conduct of men on the earth, and looking if he can find a man of true wisdom and piety, but without success. He has a certain class in view, persons reckless and tyrannical, the great mass of his contemporaries, whose actions are strongly characterised: and the terms applied to them are extended to every individual, as if there were not a single person righteous. In this melancholy state of mind he speaks as if *not one* were pious, an exaggeration which is immediately disproved by the statements of the fifth and sixth verses. This poetical description, and its hyperbolical part in particular, dogmatic theologians have improperly used as proof of man's sinful state by nature. Such is not its primary meaning. It is not intended to set forth his *original sin*; nor does it speak of *such* sin. The apostle Paul himself does not employ it as a *proof of man's inherent depravity*, but *historically*, as evidence of the moral corruption prevailing among Jews and Gentiles, the corruption of the mass of both classes; and therefore he draws the general conclusion that all the world is guilty before God (Rom. iii. 10, etc.). Even as applied by him, its object is not to evolve the doctrine of original sin or innate depravity. Here then is another example of systematic theologians transforming a poetical way of speaking into a dogma with which it has no *direct* contact according to the writer's own ideas. The inferences of divines have done great injury to the right interpretation of the Bible, and

thrown a dark veil over the character of God which His attributes reject.¹

Again, the language of the eighteenth psalm (8-20) merely implies that the writer describes his wonderful deliverances in the strongest poetical figures. He does not use the form of history, but figurative language. A sublime theophany is introduced for this purpose :

Then the earth shook and trembled,
The foundations also of the hills moved
And were shaken because he was wroth.
There went up a smoke out of his nostrils,
And fire out of his mouth devoured
Coals were kindled by it.

He bowed the heavens also and came down,
And darkness was under his feet.
And he rode upon a cherub and did fly ;
Yea, he did fly upon the wings of the wind.
He made darkness his secret place ;
His pavilion round about him were dark waters and thick clouds of the skies.

At the brightness that was before him his thick clouds passed,
Hailstones and coals of fire.

The Lord also thundered in the heavens,
And the highest gave his voice,
Hailstones and coals of fire.

Yea, he sent out his arrows and scattered them,
And he shot out lightnings and discomfited them.
Then the channels of waters were seen,
And the foundations of the world were discovered,
At thy rebuke, O Lord,
At the blast of the breath of thy nostrils.

He sent from above, he took me,
He drew me out of many waters,
He delivered me from my strong enemy,
And from them which hated me for they were too strong for me

All this is a poetical description of God's intervention as a scene presented to the senses. It should not therefore be interpreted historically, as if certain phenomena and events corresponded to it in nature. We do not know if there were any foundation in fact for the description. Probably there was not, since the language is general. It should not be supposed, therefore, that the psalmist intends to shew that God aided him and the Israelites in a battle, interposing in the midst of a tempest accompanied by thunder, hail, and lightning.

In like manner various psalms (vi., xxii., xxx., xxxi., xxxviii.), represent extreme suffering of mind or anguish of spirit, as

¹ See Hupfeld's *Die Psalmen*, vol. iii. p. 1, et seqq.

bodily sickness or disease. The Psalmists do not there describe disease of the body, as if they were sick on that account; but internal distress, figuratively.

The hyperbolical nature of the language employed in the Psalms, and the absurdity of taking it for proof of dogmas is obvious by understanding literally such sentences as, "so foolish was I and ignorant; a beast have I been with thee" (Ps. lxxiii. 22), or, "the wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies" (lviii. 3)—exaggerated modes of expression, as every reader at once perceives. Even Alexander admits this.

XVII. DEVOTIONAL CHARACTER OF THE BOOK.—The book of Psalms is admirably fitted to cherish devotional feelings, and has been used for such purpose in all ages. The subjects presented are manifold. The perfections of God, His constant care over all His creatures, His moral government, His fatherly character, His holiness and glory, His afflictive dispensations, and all the moods of the spiritual mind, are described with more or less fullness. The writers seem to have passed through every variety of religious experience; so that the expression of their feelings corresponds to that of the devout heart everywhere. The phases of spiritual life appear in this treasury of devotion; and therefore the prayers and praises of the church have been offered in the language of it, from age to age. Many of them might be termed *prayers* with great propriety. In these an earnest cry arises for the divine protection and help against enemies who are often described as wicked, cunning, violent men. With supplication for new favours are frequently united thanks for benefits already received. In addition to these psalms of *supplication and thanks*, the feelings of the pious go forth in admonitions to the godly, in quieting of the pious respecting the anomalous relation between the outward conditions of the ungodly and the upright, as well as in warnings and threatenings of the enemies of God. The glory of the divine dwelling-place on earth, and the dignity of the rulers of Israel appointed and protected by God, are occasionally spoken of, as also the longed-for restoration of David's royal house. In all, there is more or less direct reference to the Israelitish religion, a fact which explains various characteristic phenomena, such as prayers for the destruction of enemies and curses against them, the earthly and local habitation of Jehovah in Jerusalem, the confidence expressed respecting the divine interposition on behalf of Jehovah's kingly representatives on earth. But as the highest aspirations of the heart in God-fearing men are essentially the same; as its hopes, fears, convictions, sorrows, and joys are alike; the expressions of these in the psalter find a ready response

in every bosom which the Spirit of God has touched. Whether trust in Jehovah, and his righteous government, the confession of sin, the breathing after nearer fellowship with Deity, the imploring of mercy and pardon be uttered by the speakers, the multitudinous tones strike the chords of the human soul, and awaken their notes. Hence the psalter has been justly reckoned the most important book of the Old Testament. It is the most subjective of an objective dispensation. If it speaks to our deepest sentiments of devotion and not only excites but sustains the most unwavering trust in God; if it inculcates resignation to the divine will under all circumstances; if it fills the soul with a holy aversion to evil, and guides it onward to true conversion, it may well be prized by Christians. In short, if the religious feeling in man finds its worthiest and most elevated expression there, as it assuredly does; where is the devout spirit who does not value the psalter as his choice companion, either in the hours of silent meditation, or of social fellowship in the congregation?

“The reason why the psalms have found such constant favour in the sight of the Christian church, and come to constitute a chief portion of every missal and liturgy and form of worship public or private, while forms of doctrine and discourse have undergone such manifold changes, in order to represent the changing spirit of the age and the diverse conditions of the human mind, is to be found in this, that they address themselves to the simple instinctive feeling of the renewed soul, which are its most constant and permanent part; whereas the forms of doctrine and discourse address themselves to the spiritual understanding, which differs in ages and countries, according to the degrees of spiritual illumination, and the energy of spiritual life. For as those instincts of our nature which put themselves forth in infancy and early life towards our parents and our kindred and our friends, and derive thence the nourishment upon which they live, are far more constant than those opinions which we afterwards form concerning society, civil polity, and the world in general; and, as those impressions of place and scene and incident which come in upon us in our early years, are not only more constant in their endurance, but more uniform in their effect upon the various minds which are submitted to them, than any which are afterwards made by objects better fitted to affect us both permanently and powerfully—so we reckon that there is an infancy of the spiritual man, which, with all its instincts, wanders abroad over the word of God to receive the impressions thereof and grow upon their wholesome variety into a maturity of spiritual reason, when it becomes desirous to combine and arrange into conceptions and

systems of conceptions the manifoldness and variety of those simple impressions which it hath obtained. During those days of its spiritual infancy, the soul rejoiceth as a little child at the breast of its mother, feeds upon the word of God with a constant relish, delights in the views and prospects which open upon every side, and glories in its heavenly birthright and royal kindred, and considereth with wonder the kingdom of which it is become a denizen, its origin, its miraculous progress and everlasting glory; and as the infant life opens itself to the sun of righteousness, it delights in its activity, and exhales on all around the odour of its breathing joy.

"To this season of the spiritual mind the psalms come most opportunely as its natural food. We say not that they quicken the life, to which nothing is so appropriate as the words of our Lord recorded in the Gospels, but, being quickened, they nourish up the life to manhood, and when its manly age is come, prepare it for the strong meat which is to be found in the writings of the prophets and the apostles. But ever afterwards the souls of believers recur to these psalms as the home of their childhood, where they came to know the loving-kindness of their heavenly Father, the fatness of his house, and the full river of his goodness, his pastoral carefulness, his sure defence, and his eye slumbereth not nor sleepeth, with every other simple representation of divine things, to the simple affections of the renewed soul. Therefore are these psalms to the Christian, what the love of parents, and the sweet affections of home, and the clinging memory of infant scenes, and the generous love of country, are to men of every rank and order and employment, of every kindred and tongue and nation."¹

XVIII. THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST PSALM.—In the Septuagint, Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic translations there is an additional psalm. It was never in the Hebrew, and must therefore be apocryphal, though ancient. The following English version of it is from Brenton's English Septuagint.

"This psalm is a genuine one of David, though supernumerary, composed when he fought in single combat with Goliath.

"1 I was small among my brethren and youngest in my father's house: I tended my father's sheep. 2 My hands formed a musical instrument, and my fingers tuned a psaltery. 3 And who shall tell my Lord? The Lord himself, he himself hears. 4 He sent forth his angel, and took me from my father's sheep, and he anointed me with the oil of his anointing. 5 My brothers were handsome and tall; but the Lord did not take pleasure in them. 6 I went forth to meet the Philistine; and

¹ Introductory Essay to Horne's Commentary on the Psalms, by the Rev. Edward Irving, pp. vi. vii., ed. New York, 1846.

he cursed me by his idols. 7 But I drew his own sword and beheaded him, and removed reproach from the children of Israel."

XIX. QUOTATIONS FROM THE BOOK, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.
—The book of Psalms has an undoubted right to its place in the canon. Many passages are quoted from it by our Lord and his apostles, and are also referred to the Holy Spirit. The following is a list of the places cited:—

Psalm ii. 1, 2	...	Acts iv. 25, 26.
" ii. 7	...	Acts xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5; v. 5.
" v. 9	...	Rom. iii. 13.
" viii. 2	...	Matt. xxi. 16.
" viii. 4-6	...	Heb. ii. 6-8.
" viii. 6	...	1 Cor. xv. 27.
" x. 7	...	Rom. iii. 14.
" xiv. 1-3	...	Rom. iii. 10-12.
" xvi. 8-11	...	Acts ii. 25-28, 31.
" xvi. 10	...	Acts xiii. 35.
" xviii. 49	...	Rom. xv. 9.
" xix. 4	...	Rom. x. 18.
" xxii. 1	...	Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34.
" xxii. 8	...	Matt. xxvii. 43.
" xxii. 18	...	Matt. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 24; Luke xxiii. 34; John xix. 24.
" xxii. 22	...	Heb. ii. 12.
" xxiv. 1	...	1 Cor. x. 26.
" xxxi. 5	...	Luke xxiii. 46.
" xxxii. 1, 2	...	Rom. iv. 7, 8.
" xxxiv. 12-16	...	1 Pet. iii. 10-12.
" xxxvi. 1	...	Rom. iii. 18.
" xl. 6-8	...	Heb. x. 5-7.
" xli. 9	...	John xiii. 18; Acts i. 16.
" xliv. 22	...	Rom. viii. 36.
" xlv. 6, 7	...	Heb. i. 8, 9.
" lxviii. 18	...	Ephes. iv. 7, 8.
" lxix. 9	...	Rom. xv. 3.
" lxix. 21	...	John xix. 28, 29; Matt. xxvii. 34, 48; Mark xv. 36; Luke xxiii. 36.
" lxix. 22, 23	...	Rom. xi. 9, 10.
" lxix. 25; cix. 8	...	Acts i. 20.
" lxxviii. 24	...	John vi. 31.
" lxxxii. 6	...	John x. 34.
" xci. 11, 12	...	Matt. iv. 6; Luke iv. 10, 11.
" xciv. 11	...	1 Cor. iii. 20.
" xcv. 7-11	...	Heb. iii. 7-11; iv. 3, 5-7.

Psalm	xcvii. 7	Heb. i. 6.
„	cii. 25-27	Heb. i. 10-12.
„	civ. 4	Heb. i. 7.
„	cx. 1	Matt. xxii. 44 ; Mark xii. 36 ; Luke xx. 42 ; Acts ii. 34, 35 ; Heb. i. 13.
„	cx. 4	Heb. v. 6.
„	cxii. 9	2 Cor. ix. 9.
„	cxvi. 10	2 Cor. iv. 13.
„	cxviii. 6	Heb. xiii. 6.
„	cxviii. 22, 23	Matt. xxi. 42 ; Luke xx. 17 ; Acts iv. 11 ; 1 Pet. ii. 7.
„	cxviii. 25, 26	Matt. xxi. 9 ; Mark xi. 9 ; John xii. 13.
„	cxlii. 11-17	Luke i. 6-9 ; Acts ii. 30.
„	cxl. 3	Rom. iii. 13.

THE BOOK OF PROVERBS.

I. NAME.—The Hebrew word מִשְׁל, whose plural is employed as a general title to the book, properly denotes *similitude* or *comparison*. Hence it is applied to *the parable*. By a natural transition it means a *sententious saying* or *apophthegm*, which consists in the comparison of things or sentiments. And as such kind of saying often passes into a proverb, it came to signify a proverb. Akin to מִשְׁל is מְלִיצָה *an obscure maxim*, one needing interpretation. So too חִידָה *a knotty saying or riddle*, whose sense is enigmatical or difficult of solution.

The Jews call the book מִשְׁלֵי שְׁלֹמֹה *proverbs of Solomon*, or more briefly מִשְׁלֵי *proverbs*. This is its common appellation in the Talmud. In the Tosephoth to Baba Bathra, the name סֵפֶר חֲכָמָה *book of wisdom*, is given both to it and Ecclesiastes. The Septuagint title is a literal translation of the Hebrew, παροιμιαὶ Σολομώντος. The fathers of the Christian church, in addition to this appellation of the Septuagint's, styled it σοφία, *wisdom*, and ἡ πανάρετος σοφία, *all-virtuous wisdom*. So Clement quotes it in his Epistle to the Corinthians.¹ The latter titles were also applied by the fathers to the Proverbs of Jesus Sirach, and the Book of Wisdom.

II. DIVISIONS AND CONTENTS.—The contents of the book are separable into seven divisions, which have all different titles, except one. These are:—1. Chaps. i.-ix. 2. Chaps. x.-xxii. 16. 3. Chaps. xxii. 17-xxiv. 4. Chaps. xxv.-xxix. 5. Chap. xxx. 6. Chap. xxxi. 1-9. 7. Chap. xxxi. 10-31.

First. The first part (i. 7-ix.) consists of admonitions to strive after the possession of wisdom under all circumstances, and to avoid whatever is opposed to it. Here we find four sections, viz., i. 7-33; ii.-iv.; v.-vii.; viii., ix.

1. (i. 7-33) (a) The seventh verse announces the subject to

¹ See Hefele's *patrum Apostolicorum opp.* p. 63, second edition.

be treated of, viz., wisdom. In the eighth and ninth verses the admonition has respect to the relation of the son to his teacher ; and exhorts the former not to put away instruction from him, for it is his most beautiful ornament.

(b) The second admonition (10-19) is a dissuasive from joining those who make light of robbery and murder, endeavouring to allure young men into their own way of life as if it were pleasant and profitable. Youth are cautioned against associating with such characters, and assured that their ways will not succeed, but bring ruin on themselves.

(c) In opposition to the alluring invitation of these wicked men, a louder and more earnest call, urging the fear of God, is addressed to youth by wisdom. She speaks in the market-places, at the corners of the streets and in the meetings of the people, exhorting fools to leave their folly and listen to her instructions (20-23). If they do not hear her call but persist in their folly, a sudden and terrible destruction will come upon them, when she will scornfully remain unmoved by their cries (24-27). Then shall men long after her, but in vain ; they must eat, to the full, the fruits of their perversity (28-31). It is a sure thing that a judgment comes upon fools and such as resist wisdom ; while those who hearken to her have nothing to fear (32, 33).

2. (ii.-iv.) (a) A teacher exhorts his disciple to strive earnestly for wisdom, setting forth the blessing which its possession brings with it. Such a seeker will receive wisdom and knowledge from God ; he will lead a pious life and be preserved ; justice and uprightness will not be unknown to him, and he will be kept from the dangers and temptations which evil men put near him (ii. 1-15). He shall be able to withstand the seductive arts of the unfaithful woman, who draws into deadly destruction those who go in to her (16-19). We must therefore walk in the path of the good, for they alone shall have permanent happiness ; while the bad are exposed to sudden destruction (20-22).

The teacher exhorts his disciple to give heed to his instructions, for long life and peace will follow ; not to neglect kindness and uprightness, since these qualities will procure favour and good understanding in the sight of God and man ; to trust in the Lord and lean upon him ; not to be wise in his own conceit but to fear the Lord and abstain from evil, so shall he have health and refreshment ; to honour the Lord with a part of his substance, and *He* will make abundant provision for his support (iii. 1-10).

(b) He is not to despise the corrections of the Lord, since they are an evidence of fatherly love on the part of Jehovah

(11-12). The praises of wisdom are again introduced. Her rewards are better than gold, silver, jewels, etc. She gives long life, riches, honour, loveliness, peace; is a tree of life to such as lay hold of her. Jehovah established the earth and the heavens by her assistance; he divided the waters and made the clouds drop down dew (13-20).

(c) Returning to the admonitory strain at the commencement of the chapter, the teacher exhorts the pupil not to despise truth and reflection; they will keep him in safety, enable him to lie down and sleep securely, no fear of destruction disturbing him since Jehovah is his keeper. One must not withhold any good from his poor neighbour, nor put him off with a promise, nor devise evil against him, nor causelessly contend with him, nor imitate the oppressor's conduct; because Jehovah hates the wicked and blesses the righteous. Since he mocks scorers and gives grace to the lowly, the wise obtain honour; whereas shame sweeps away fools (21-35).

(d) The children are admonished to listen to the instruction of the teacher, who looking back to his early youth recollects how his father once taught and incited to strive after wisdom, representing that the possession of it would keep him in safety and adorn him with a beautiful crown (iv. 1-9). The teacher promises to shew the pupil a way in which he should walk securely, viz., by taking fast hold of instruction, and keeping wisdom, who is life. But the path of the wicked must be carefully avoided; for they are sleepless unless they can do mischief. The path of the just is always clearer and clearer; that of transgressors is dark, so that they stumble (10-19). The pupil is again exhorted to give diligent heed, and guard his heart above all things; because the issues of life proceed from it. He must keep his mouth from deceit, look only on the path which is straight, carefully consider his goings, and remove his foot from evil things (20-27).

3. (v.-vii.) The disciple is again requested to hear the warning of his teacher and lay it to heart; for though the words of the adulteress are sweet, their end is pain and death; just as she herself is exposed to sudden death. The admonition to listen is repeated; and the pupil is exhorted to keep far from her, lest the fearful punishments of adultery overtake him, and self-reproach come when it is too late, from not listening to teachers and running into deadly peril (1-14). The young man is counselled to be faithful to the spouse of his youth. He must not go after adulteresses; for God knows the ways of the transgressor, and will not suffer him to go unpunished. The iniquities of the wicked will surely overtake them; and they shall die through their folly in not receiving instruction (15-23).

Should one be ensnared by a pledge of security he is advised to procure an accommodation as soon as possible, that the person pledged might escape the peril of being sold into slavery (vi. 1-5). The lazy man is exhorted to learn instruction from the ant, who provides for herself in season. If he will not bestir himself to action, poverty and want will destroy him (6-11). Seven vices are specified; and the man who practises them will be suddenly destroyed (12-15). Seven crimes are enumerated, which excite Jehovah's indignation (16-19).

The instruction of parents is said to adorn the son and be a continual protection, because it is a light, a way—that leads to life. It will keep him from the most dangerous temptations of the adulterous woman. He is exhorted not to lust after her beauty, because adultery exposes to the loss of life. As one cannot come in contact with fire without injury, so is it with the adulterer. Even a thief is not spared, though he steals to satisfy hunger. He has to make abundant restitution. An adulterer is devoid of reason and destroys himself. He incurs the greatest reproach. The enraged and jealous husband will not be pacified with gifts (20-35).

The alluring arts and modes of temptation practised by the adulteress are described, after a few verses of introduction in which the pupil is exhorted to give diligent heed to the admonitions (vii. 1-27).

4. (viii., ix.) In contrast with the adulteress, who entices individuals in the night time, wisdom cries aloud in the most frequented places. She addresses all men, even the simple, entreating them to hear the noble and excellent truths she utters. Her instruction is more valuable than pearls or precious stones. She has sagacity and knowledge, and possesses the qualities without which rulers cannot govern. She loves those who seek her, and bestows on them the highest gifts. She is the first of all Jehovah's creatures; was established before waters, mountains, the earth itself; was present when God made the world; not merely as a witness but an artificer did she stand by his side. She was his darling child, always rejoicing before him in the world and among men. Finally, she exhorts men to listen to her, because those who seek her earnestly will obtain the favour of God. But such as miss her, destroy their own life (viii. 1-36). Wisdom has prepared a rich feast in her splendid house, to which she invites, by her maidens as well as by herself, those who lack understanding. The scorner and the transgressor are not fit subjects for her instructions, and would not receive or profit by them. Not so with the wise. Wisdom is the fear of God, securing long life. But the adulteress addresses the simple. Whoever is foolish allows

himself to be tempted, not knowing that her ways lead to swift destruction (ix. 1-18).

Second. (x.-xxii. 16). This is the most important division of the book. The parts, however, are so loosely connected, that it is impossible to give a summary of them. Perhaps the whole might be subdivided into x. 1-xii. 28; xiii. 1-xv. 32; xv. 33-xviii. 24; xix. 1-xxi. 31; xxii. 1-16.

Third. (xxii. 17-xxiv.) This is also a miscellaneous collection of proverbs, consisting of an exhortation to listen to the words of the wise (17-21); ten warnings (xxii. 22-xxiii. 11); ten additional warnings (xxiii. 12-xxiv. 2); twenty verses (xxiv. 3-22); a small appendix with an inscription for itself (xxiv. 23-34).

Fourth. (xxv. 1-xxix.). This division is too miscellaneous to admit of a proper summary. Perhaps it may be separated thus: xxv. 1-xxvii. 27; xxviii. 1-16; and xxviii. 17-xxix.

Fifth. (xxx. 1-33). The author begins with the confession that he has endeavoured in vain to search out God. Such an attempt was the deed of an uncommonly stupid man as he now sees; because he had not first learned wisdom and theology. Many questions that must remain unanswered, press upon him who reflects on God and His works. He will therefore abide solely by the revelation of God, and find rest in faith. This revelation is pure and perfect. Do not add to it, lest God punish you and you become a liar. The poet asks God to give him one of two wishes, viz., to remove from him falsehood and lying words; and to feed him with the bread of his allotted portion. Four classes of people are specified: also four things which are too wonderful for the writer to understand. The rule of four things is intolerable. He next specifies four things, which though small in themselves are very wise. Three things excel in gait.

Sixth. (xxxi. 1-9). These are the instructions of Lemuel's mother, containing cautions against incontinence and drunkenness; with an admonition to do justice.

Seventh. (xxxi. 10-31). A description of the skilful and industrious wife.

III. TITLES AND CHARACTERISTICS.—The first verse gives the general title; and the next six verses are a general introduction to the whole book (i. 1-7).

The title of the second part is, *the Proverbs of Solomon*.

The title of the third part might be represented by, *the words of the wise*.

The fourth part contains, according to the title, *Proverbs of Solomon which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out*.

The fifth part contains *the words of Agur*.

The sixth part is entitled, *the words of Lemuel king of Massa*.

The seventh has no particular inscription, except the commencing verse (xxxi. 10) be considered such. Yet it is in the interrogative form.

Characteristics of part first.—(a) Nearly all the verses consist of two members each, as

We shall find all precious substance :
We shall fill our houses with spoil (i. 13).

Very few consist of three members; only ten, viz., i. 22, 23, 27; iii. 3; iv. 4; v. 19; vi. 3, 13; vii. 23; ix. 2.

(b) Nearly all the verses consist of *synonymous* parallels. Out of 247 verses, 209 are *synonymous*; 36 *synthetic*; and 4 *antithetic*, according to Stuart.¹

(c) Single paragraphs often begin a new address to the pupil, as i. 8, 10; ii. 1; iii. 1, 11; iv. 10, 20; v. 1; vi. 1, 20; vii. 1.

(d) Three paragraphs are usually connected in a certain manner with one another; so that the fullness of admonition culminates and completes in the third. Comp. chap. iii.

(e) Paragraphs often consist of ten verses; as i. 10-19; iii. 1-10; 11-20; iv. 10-19; viii. 12-21; 22-31.

(f) The sentences are generally long. Thus the greater part of the second chapter consists of one long sentence, wearily drawn through nearly twenty verses. Comp. also vii. 6-20; ix. 13-18; v. 3-6; 8-14; 15-19.

Characteristics of part second.—(a) Each verse contains an independent sentence, whose sense is complete in itself.

(b) While the verses regularly consist of two members each, the prevailing parallelism is *antithetic*, at least in x.-xv. But in xvi.-xxii. 16, the *synthetic* predominates. According to Stuart, there are 186 *antithetic* parallelisms in the former, and 23 *synthetic*; in the latter, 159 *synthetic*, and only 24 *antithetic*.²

(c) The two members of each verse usually contain seven words, of which four belong to the first and three to the second, as,

דְּבַר שֶׁקֶר יִשְׁנָא צָדִיק
וְרָשָׁע יְבֹאֵשׁ וַיִּחְפֹּר (xiii. 5.)

Occasionally there are eight words; four in each member, or three in one and five in the other, as,

לֵב יוֹדֵעַ מֶרֶת נַפְשׁוֹ
וּבְשִׁמְחָתוֹ לֹא יִתְעַרֵּב זָר (xiv. 10.)

¹ Commentary on the book of Proverbs, Introduction, p. 19. ² Ibid. pp. 19, 20.

More rarely there are nine words in a verse, as,

קִנְיָה חֶבְרָה מֵה־טוֹב מִחֶרֶץ
וְקִנְיֹת בִּינָה נִבְחַר מִכָּסֶּף (xvi. 16.)

Sometimes the words amount to ten or eleven, when one or two little words are united with principal ones.

(d) Two verses are put beside one another in which the same characteristic word, or two similar words occur; as in x. 6, 7, צַדִּיק and רָשָׁעִים are found in both verses. It is an extension of this grouping when the word יְהוָה occurs in ten verses in succession; see xv. 33 and xvi. 1-7, 9, 11. In the same way מֶלֶךְ appears in the five verses, xvi. 10, 12-15.¹

Characteristics of part third.—(a) A proverb is most frequently contained in two verses, and in such a way that the second contains a reason for the first. Thus,

Make no friendship with an angry man,
And with a furious man thou shalt not go;
Lest thou learn his ways,
And get a snare to thy soul (xxii. 24, 25).

Three verses are often closely connected in this manner, as,

When thou sittest to eat with a ruler,
Consider diligently what is before thee;
And put a knife to thy throat,
If thou be a man given to appetite:
Be not desirous of his dainties,
For they are deceitful meat (xxiii. 1-3).

Even five verses occur thus together in xxiv. 30-34.

It is very seldom that a complete proverb is contained in a single verse, as in xxii. 28, 29; xxiii. 9.

(b) The structure of verses is irregular, so that the members of them are not evenly proportioned. Indeed there is often no trace of parallelism. Verses of six, seven, or eight words are intermingled with others of eleven and even of fourteen and eighteen words. Thus xxiii. 29 has fourteen, and xxiv. 12, eighteen words.

(c) Proverbs of similar import are not generally put together. Sometimes, however, such sayings are arranged so as to form a rounded circle of admonitions.

(d) The parallelisms are *synthetic*; except xxiv. 16 which is *antithetic*.²

Characteristics of part fourth.—(a) Most of the proverbs are here

¹ See Bertheau's *Die Sprüche Salomo's*, Einleitung, pp. xii., xiii.

² *Ibid*, pp. xiii., xiv.

finished in one verse. And the verses usually consist of seven or eight words; more rarely of six. But when the sentences run through two or more verses, the words in both are more numerous. Thus xxv. 6, 7 contain twenty words; xxv. 21, 22 have eighteen words.

(b) According to Stuart, there are ninety-three *synthetic* parallelisms, and thirty-five *antithetic* ones.¹ Pretty often there is no trace of parallelism; as in xxv. 8, 9, 10, 21, 22; xxvi. 18, 19; xxvii. 1; xxix. 12.

(c) In chaps. xxv.-xxvii. the two members in which most of the sentences are arranged, are usually comparisons loosely hanging together.

(d) The same word often appears in two or more successive proverbs; as מְלָכִים in xxv. 1, 2; רֵיב in xxv. 8, 9, 10.²

Characteristics of part fifth.—(a) The proverbs in this part are of very unequal compass. Some are completed in one verse, as, xxx. 10; others in two, as xxx. 15, 16; others in three, as 18-20, 21-23; others in four, as 24-28; and in six, as 1-6.

(b) The verses contain a considerable number of words; eleven, twelve, and thirteen.

(c) All the parallelisms are *synthetic*.

(d) The descriptions are somewhat long for proverbs; and the language artificial and peculiar.

(e) Numbers play an important part. Things are reckoned by twos, threes, fours, etc.

Characteristics of part sixth.—Here the parallelisms are *synonymous*; the same ideas being repeated almost in the same words in the corresponding members.

Characteristics of part seventh.—This is an *alphabetical* poem. The parallelism is very like that in the alphabetical psalms; and the verses are nearly all of the same extent.

IV. AUTHORSHIP.—We are now prepared to enter on the question of authorship.

The general title and introduction (i. 1-7) refer to the whole book, not to the first part by itself. If i. 8-ix. was written by Solomon, why should the second part have the title, *the proverbs of Solomon*? (x. 1). Does not this imply a distinction between what follows and precedes, as if the latter were not written by Solomon? We confess that every view we can take of the first division is unfavourable to its Solomonic origin. Its didactic tone, with the strict admonitions respecting chastity, do not suit a king so well as a prophet or priest. Various parts do not resemble the precepts of one who kept a royal harem, and was the fruit of adultery with Bathsheba, as v. 18, etc., vi. 24, etc.,

¹ Commentary, Introduction, p. 44.

² See Bertheau, Einleitung, pp. xiv., xv.

vii. 5-23, except he had repented. Occasionally the writer speaks like a man occupying the condition of a citizen, ex. gr. vi. 31. A few local references point to Jerusalem (i. 21, viii. 3); and perhaps mention of the new moon (vii. 20) shews that the levitical worship was regularly observed.

The same tone of theocratic purity which appears in x.-xxii. 16 did not exist when these proverbs were written. The kingly office no longer corresponded to its ideal. The hints relating to it imply the melancholy consequences of royal power in denying the principle of righteousness and adding to the influence of transgressors. We must therefore date it subsequently to the reigns of Solomon and David, towards the end of the ninth or beginning of the eighth, century before Christ. The form of the proverb had then become more rounded and developed.

Did the portion proceed from one author? The question is not without its difficulties. Eichhorn, and after him Ewald, think that the piece is an original whole, well-connected, continuous, proceeding as it were out of one gush. On the other hand, Bertheau finds traces in it of admonitions and sayings proceeding from different authors. His arguments are in substance the following :

1. The repetitions are of such a nature as to shew more than one author. Thus the strange woman is introduced not less than five times; while wisdom is referred to more or less fully eight times. The same writer would hardly repeat himself so often, within a compass comparatively brief.

2. Chap. vi. 1-19 interrupts the connection. It contains warning and advice respecting various situations in life, which are only *appended* to the preceding chapter descriptive of the strange woman. The seventh chapter introduces the adulteress again. Hence vi. 1-19, should properly stand after chap. vii.

3. Various paragraphs, as we have seen, contain groups of ten verses. This is an artificial arrangement which could not have been accidental. Why then should one author adopt this law only in some places, when he might have easily carried it through the whole?

4. The diction, style, and structure of verses is varied in different parts. We admit that this might have proceeded from one and the same gifted writer, varying his manner according to the topic or to taste. The diversity, however, between the second chapter and viii. 12-31, hardly comports with identity of origin.¹

A careful consideration of the particulars contained in i. 8-ix. will shew, that there is an orderly arrangement of the materials,

¹ Bertheau's *Commentar*, *Einleitung*, pp. xxii., xxiii.

and a connection betraying one and the same author. His theme is one. He discusses it in his own way, approaching it gradually, and after treating it, returning to the point whence he set out. He admonishes youth against adultery in the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters. But this he comes to by the fear of God as the beginning of wisdom (chap. i.) ; by comparing and identifying the fear of God and wisdom itself (chaps. ii.-iv). After the main theme, he returns to wisdom, which he personifies and praises (viii.), contrasting it with folly (ix.) Thus all centres in one and the same object—the fear of God, and wisdom in one important practical aspect. In some places the arrangement is artificial, as in the third and fourth chapters where there are three strophes. The language is uniform, confirming *unity* of authorship, as שְׁנוֹת חַיִּים (iii. 2 ; iv. 10 ; ix. 11). The repetitions agree as well with one writer as several. Indeed they are almost unavoidable in the discussion of the same theme carried through various chapters, provided there be progression, as is the case. The unknown writer is eloquent, graphic, pathetic. His descriptions are pertinent and admirable. He uses a noble simplicity. The language is exceedingly chaste, occasionally rising to an epic fullness, and never sinking below the subject. It is easy and smooth. Hebrew literature must have been in a flourishing state when he lived.¹

But though we hold the evidence of the order and arrangement of the piece as well as of the diction satisfactory in relation to one writer, there are portions which must be excepted, because they disturb the connection. The most conspicuous of these is vi. 1-19. If it be taken away, vi. 20 naturally succeeds v. 23. In like manner, ix. 7-10 is an insertion disturbing the parts between which it stands and otherwise evincing a different origin. vi. 1-19 consists of four independent sections loosely joined together, viz., 1-5, 6-11, 12-15, 16-19. These seem to proceed from as many writers ; none identical with the author of part i.-ix. It is very improbable that such intercalations were made by the writer of i.-ix. They are inferior in thought and style ; later in origin. He would not have put them where they are, had he found them already existing. They belong to a succeeding time. From these observations it will be seen, that we cannot believe fully in Ewald's opinion of the unity of the piece, nor in Bertheau's of its disunion. Delitzsch² agrees with the former in the main ; but arbitrarily divides the whole into what he terms fifteen Mashal-poems, and indulges in other minutiae of criticism equally fanciful.

¹ Hitzig, *Die Sprüche Salomo's*, pp. 3, 4.

² Herzog's *Encyclopaedia*, vol. xiv. p. 697, et seqq.

It has been observed that some things in i.-ix resemble passages in Job. Thus, iii. 25 :

Be not afraid of sudden fear,
Neither of the desolation of the wicked when it cometh,

reminds one of Job v. 21 :

Neither shalt thou be afraid of destruction when it cometh.

Chap. viii. 25 :

Before the hills was I brought forth,

compare with Job xv. 7 :

Wast thou made before the hills ?

Compare also ii. 4, 14, with Job iii. 21, 22 ; iv. 12 with Job xviii. 7 ; iii. 11, 13, with Job v. 17.

These coincidences shew, that the author of the book of Job had at least read the part of Proverbs under consideration. There are also a few places which resemble the Song of Solomon. But the latter is older. Song of Sol. iv. 11, seems reflected in Proverbs v. 3 ; and viii. 7 in vi. 35. The word *הָרָרִין* *gold* (iii. 13, viii. 19) which ceased to be used in the 8th century, together with the old form *רָעִי* (iii. 28), and the fact of this part being posterior to the Song of Solomon but prior to Job, point to the 9th century as the date. And the writer seems to have lived in Jerusalem, where there were luxury and elegance (vii. 16, 17). His language is that of one highly cultivated.

Was Solomon the writer of i.-ix ? To this question a negative answer must be given.

The title of the second part assigns it to Solomon. It certainly proceeded from another person than the author of i. 8-ix. The parallelism of verses is different, not being *synonymous*, but *antithetic* and *synthetic*, the former being predominant. The poetical character of the first is much higher. The use of Elohim too never appears in the second (ii. 5, 17). Jehovah is generally used in all places of the book except in the first part and the words of Agur where it appears but seldom.

It is stated in 1 Kings iv. 32 that Solomon spake 3000 proverbs, of which many were probably preserved. We cannot hold their number to be apocryphal, or to transcend the wisdom of David's son.

The views, ideas, modes in which they are expressed, the *usus loquendi* and *formulas* in which the matter is put are similar throughout this portion. Thus what gives pleasure to the fool and the righteous respectively, is analogous even in language (x. 23 ; xiv. 9 ; xv. 21). So with self-satisfaction (xiv. 12 ; xvi. 2 ; xxi. 2). Weights and measures are similarly spoken of

(xi. 1; xx. 10, 23); suretyship (xi. 15; xvii. 18; xx. 16); the simplicity of the inexperienced (xiv. 15; xxii. 3); the want of friends by the poor man (xiv. 20; xix. 7); and contentment with little (xv. 17; xvi. 8; xvii. 1). The ideas respecting the correction of children are alike (xiii. 24; xix. 18; xxii. 15). The sacrifice of the wicked is spoken of in the same words (xv. 8; xxi. 27). Analogous views harmonise in expression, as x. 15 and xviii. 11; xi. 13 and xx. 19. Sometimes half a verse returns, as xiii. 2 from xii. 14; xviii. 11 from x. 15; xviii. 12 from xv. 33. But these half verses do not always retain the same places (comp. xvi. 5 with xi. 21). They are altered somewhat (comp. xvi. 2 with xxi. 2; xiii. 14 with xiv. 27); so that they are not exactly the same (comp. xiv. 31 with xvii. 5, xv. 13 with xvii. 22). The language is also of the same type. The same figurative expressions, as well as others not figurative, recur. Whoever, for example, wrote xx. 11, wrote also xxi. 8. So with xiv. 26 and xxi. 22. A well of life is repeatedly mentioned (x. 11; xvi. 22); a tree of life (xi. 30; xiii. 12; xv. 4); wealth got hastily (xiii. 11; xx. 21); lips of knowledge (xiv. 7; xx. 15). As xi. 24 terminates in so do xiv. 23; xxi. 5; xxii. 16. The expression "snares of death" is placed at the end of xiii. 14; xiv. 27. The verb **פָּרַד**, used of the same kind of separation, runs through four chapters, as xvi. 28, xvii. 9, xviii. 1, xix. 4.

These repetitions, accompanied as they are with greater or less variation, are adduced by Hitzig as evidences of one author. In addition to them he has called attention to several groups of verses alike in number; and to sections artificially made up of the same number multiplied upon another. But these latter have a precarious existence, and require occasional and arbitrary alterations of the text.¹ The question turns in some degree upon the fact whether one writer could compose more than a hundred proverbs or pithy sayings, without falling into partial repetitions. Hitzig thinks he could not. In regard to Solomon we differ from this critic. It seems to us very improbable that Solomon would repeat himself almost or altogether verbally.

Such likenesses as the following must be assigned to two authors; one copying the other.

Chap. xiv. 12:

There is a way which seemeth right unto a man;
But the end thereof are the ways of death,

which is repeated in xvi. 25.

¹ Die Sprüche Salomo's, p. 90 et seqq.

Chap. xvi. 2 :

All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes,

occurs again in xxi. 2.

Chap. xv. 8 :

The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination,

is repeated in xxi. 27.

Chap. xi. 13 :

A tale-bearer revealeth secrets,

occurs again in xx. 19.

Such verbal repetitions, at least, must be assigned to different writers, one imitating the other. In xxi. 19 we find :

It is better to dwell in the wilderness,
Than with a contentious and an angry woman,

which is nearly the same as xxi. 9 :

It is better to dwell in the corner of the housetop
Than with a brawling woman in a wide house.

In x. 1 we read :

A wise son maketh a glad father,

which is repeated in xv. 20¹.

In x. 2² occurs :

But righteousness delivereth from death,

repeated in xi. 4².

Chap. x. 15¹ has :

The rich man's wealth is his strong city,

which occurs in xviii. 11¹.

In xv. 33² we read :

Before honour is humility,

which returns in xviii. 12².

Chap. xi. 21¹ has,

Though hand join in hand the wicked shall not be unpunished.

Chap. xvi. 5² repeats it:

Though hand join in hand he shall not be unpunished.

In chap. xiv. 31¹ it is written :

He that oppresseth the poor reproacheth his Maker,

and the same is repeated in xvii. 5¹.

Chap. xix. 12¹ has these words :

The king's wrath is as the roaring of a lion,

repeated in xx. 2.¹

These repetitions could hardly have proceeded from one author. Yet the greater part of the division in question was written by one. Its uniformity of diction and analogy of views points to one *principal* author. Was he Solomon, as the title says? It has been supposed, that many could not be his because they relate to private and rural life, since he was not practically familiar with the one, and did not share in the other. The circumstance too, that not a few sayings concern other relations than those in which Solomon lived, excite suspicion against his being the writer; such as, xvi. 10, 12-15; xix. 12; xx. 2, 26, 28; xxiii. 1-3; apparently shewing the author to have been no king. Such phenomena are not conclusive, especially as they are confronted by others of an opposite character. The historical back-ground in various proverbs of this division presupposes that royalty in Israel corresponded to its proper idea. The king is described on the whole as one favourable to his intelligent servants, averse to evil, and taking pleasure in justice (xiv. 35; xvi. 12, 13; xx. 8, 26; xxiv. 11). Such language could only be appropriate in the flourishing time of royalty—that of David and Solomon—when the ideal of kingship was as pure as it ever appeared. The theocratic spirit then prevailed; and righteousness had penetrated the life of the people. Besides, the character and diction of the proverbs indicate an older type than that which appears in i. 8-ix. They are energetic, striking, abrupt, pregnant, obscure, pervaded by less precision, regularity, and fullness, as is natural in the incipient state of gnomic literature.¹

Agreeably to Jewish tradition, and in the absence of proof to the contrary we are inclined to assign the greatest part of the division to Solomon as its author. It is likely, however, that he himself did not put all his own proverbs into their present form. A later compiler made up the present division by collecting that monarch's oral and written sayings. Along with Solomon's he incorporated others which he was not able to separate from the authentic ones. And he may have added some of his own. That he intended to put the whole into good order is contradicted by the verbal repetitions allowed to remain. Having no means of sifting the sources with infallible accuracy, some proverbs not Solomon's were left. The two kinds of parallelism in chapters x.-xv. and xvi.-xxii. 16, the former *antithetic*, the latter *synthetic*, are compatible with

¹ See Elster, *Commentar ueber die Salomonische Sprüche*, page 10.

the same writer ; and need not, with Stuart,¹ be referred to him *at different times*. The bi-membral verses throughout indicate the same hand. Our observations tend to shew that this division belong for the most part to the end of the tenth century, preceding the former by a considerable interval—one of about a hundred years. It certainly bears decided marks of antiquity. Hitzig, however, assigns it to the eighth century, on the ground of form, language, and relations of time. That conclusion cannot be sustained. It is above a century *older* than the first part, not *later*. Ewald with his usual sagacity has assumed a considerable interval between the two divisions, putting the second prior to the first. The *redaction* of it could not have been very remote in time from that of the first part.

The third part, viz. xxii. 17-xxiv. was not written by Solomon. It exhibits two notices in which it professes to contain “words of the wise” *i.e.* xxii. 17 and xxiv. 23. This shews that it consists of two smaller collections, xxii. 22-xxiv. 22, and xxiv. 23-34. The verses xxii. 17-21 were prefixed by the compiler himself, who says, “that thy trust may be in the Lord, I have made known to thee *this day*, even to thee” (19); and, “Have not I written to thee *the day before yesterday* concerning counsel and knowledge” (20)? Herzfeld conjectures that xxiv. 23-34 also proceeded from this compiler.²

The writer is a preacher of morality who assumes a warning and admonitory tone throughout. Hence his sayings so often begin with **N**. Seventeen times in eighty-two verses does this negative particle occur ; while it appears but twice in the twelve chapters of the second part (xx. 13, 22). The writer seems to have drawn these apophthegms of the wise men from recollection ; putting them down after his own manner. The diction is uniform, and has a peculiarity which appears but seldom in the other parts, viz., the making the subject or object emphatic by repeating the pronoun, as xxii. 19 :

That thy trust may be in the Lord,
I have made known to thee *this day*, even to thee.

See also xxiii. 14, 15, 19, 20, 28 ; xxiv. 6, 27, 32. One thing is clear, viz., that there is a different authorship from that of the second part. The structure of the verses is different, being much more irregular. The even proportion of two members in a verse is often interrupted ; and parallelism almost disappears. Unlike the former, in which a verse is rounded off in two members, verses consisting of seven words

¹ Commentary, Introduction, pp. 30, 31.

² Geschichte des Volkes Israel, p. 283.

are interspersed among others containing eight, nine, eleven, and even fourteen. A verse often becomes three-membered, being antithetic in the last two members (xxii. 29; xxiii. 31). Besides, a sentence or proverb is seldom completed in a single verse. It occupies two, three, and even five (xxiv. 30-34). Proverbs too of similar import are not usually arranged so as to form a completed course of admonitions. Unlike the second part, the appeal *my son* appears here (xxiii. 19, 26; xxiv. 13); and the warning is frequently addressed to a hearer in the second person. Only once does *my son* appear in x.-xxii. 16.

It will be observed that the warning in xxii. 28 recurs in xxiii. 10; in the latter place in a later form. xxiii. 6 is repeated from verse 3; and xxiv. 14 from xxiii. 18. Such repetitions, together with the insignificance of expression in xxiv. 24, 25:

He that saith unto the wicked, Thou art righteous,
Him shall the people curse; *nations shall abhor him.*
But to them that rebuke him shall be delight,
And a good blessing shall come upon them;

and the want of proper grouping in xxiii. 13 (comp. ver. 15) evince a poverty of mind which corresponds to the almost prosaic diction and belongs to times of declining national taste. The language is tolerably late, and contains a few Aramaeisms, as קָשָׁם (xxii. 21) and שָׁכִין (xxiii. 2); חֶשֶׁךְ is used in an Aramaean sense (xxii. 29); בּוֹגְדִים for בּוֹגְדוֹת (xxiii. 28) and the reverse מַטְעֵמוֹת (xxiii. 3, 6) for מַטְעִים are later peculiarities. So too the retention of ה in לְהַעֲשִׂיר and ל for ב (xxiii. 4). These phenomena, however, are hardly sufficient to place the division in or after the time of the exile. Did the Syriacisms occur in greater number, or constructions confessedly late strike the reader more frequently, we should not hesitate to bring down the authorship after the captivity; but the grounds for doing so are too precarious. Hence Hitzig cannot be followed. His proofs of such late origin are too shadowy. There is no sufficient evidence that the writer of xxiii. or xxiv. had read Deuteronomy in its present form, or belonged to the time of the thirty-seventh psalm; or that xxiii. 11 was contemporary with Jer. l. 34. The prophet is known to have imitated and copied preceding writers. Hence we cannot see any proper evidence for bringing the date of the piece to the Persian monarchy, or after 525 B.C., as Hitzig does¹. Neither ideas nor diction point to it. The time of composition was before the exile, but later than Hezekiah.

The fourth part (xxv.-xxix.) contains the proverbs of Solo-

¹ Die Sprüche Salomo's, p. 226 et seq.

mon which the men of Hezekiah copied out. Here many proverbs occurring in the second part are repeated with slight deviations. Thus xxv. 24 :

It is better to dwell in the corner of the housetop
Than with a brawling woman and in a wide house,

is nearly the same as xxi. 9 :

It is better to dwell in a corner of the housetop
Than with a brawling woman in a wide house.

Chap xxvi. 13 :

The slothful man saith,
There is a lion in the way ;
A lion in the streets,

is almost identical with xxii. 13 :

The slothful man saith,
There is a lion without ;
I shall be slain in the streets,

Compare also xxvi. 15 with xix. 24 ; xxvi. 22 with xviii. 8 ; xxvii. 13 with xx. 16 ; xxvii. 15 with xix. 13 ; xxvii. 21 with xvii. 3 ; xxviii. 6 with xix. 1 ; xxviii. 19 with xii. 11 ; xxix. 22 with xv. 18. There is but one proverb in the third part repeated here, viz., xxviii. 21 compared with xxiv. 23.¹

Only once is the same proverb repeated in the division itself, with a slight variation.

Chap. xxvi. 12 :

Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit ?
There is more hope of a fool than of him.

Chap. xxix. 20 :

Seest thou man that is hasty in his words ?
There is more hope of a fool than of him.

In a few cases there are varieties of the same proverb, shewing that it had passed through different hands by which it was modified ; as, xxviii. 12 :

When righteous men do rejoice, there is great glory ;
But when the wicked rise, a man is hidden.

Chap. xxviii. 28 :

When the wicked rise, men hide themselves ;
But when they perish, the righteous increase.

Chap. xxix. 2 :

When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice ;
But when the wicked beareth rule, the people mourn.

¹ See Delitzsch in Herzog's Encyklopaedie, xiv. p. 705.

Solomon himself could scarcely have been the author of all the proverbs in this division. Some of them manifest another origin. Thus xxv. 2-7 betrays a man who had lived at court, but was no king himself. In like manner xxviii. 16 censures the very vices that stained Solomon's reign. From the similarity of many proverbs in the portion before us to others in the second part, it seems probable that the collectors whom Hezekiah commissioned to gather these wise sayings used in part the same sources as the compiler of the second division. That such sources were written ones is implied in the word *העתיקו* *transcribed*—transferred from one book to another (xxv. 1). But the use of it should not be pressed so far as to exclude *oral* sources, which were probably employed in addition to the written. Hitzig incorrectly explains it of oral sources only.¹ In the progress of time many proverbs in the mouths of the people had come to be attributed to the wise monarch. This happened more readily in proportion to the interval of time from the age of Solomon. These wise men of Hezekiah could not separate what belonged to the king and what were improperly assigned to him. There is no good reason for attributing the greater part to the kingdom of Ephraim. It is true that in the age of Hezekiah the northern monarchy came to an end; but it is a mere hypothesis that the king of Judah sent men to save the literary treasures existing in the mouth of the people from destruction, by having them written down. The critic in question asserts that the language has many peculiarities which point away from Judah; but fails to justify his assertion. That in xxv. 11 the Ephraimite expression stands for the Jewish in xxv. 12 may be doubted. And even if *חלי* with the feminine (xxv. 12) occurs only in a north-Israel author; *שחל* (xxvi. 13) only in Hosea and Job; and *סתר* in the passive for *הסתיר*, they are slender proof of a north-Israel origin for the whole piece. But indeed their Ephraimite characteristics may be questioned. The inscription fixes the copying to the last quarter of the eighth century.

The commencement of the division shews that it was meant as an appendix, *נס*. Why it stands after the third, instead of the second part it is difficult to tell.

The reader will now see the error of putting i.-xxix. together and attributing the whole to Solomon. When unscientific critics like Hahn and Keil do so, and even undertake to defend their position; what can be said of them, except that they ignore the phenomena on which right criticism bases its conclusions?

¹ Die Sprüche, p. 258.

Keil's paragraph in his Introduction relating to this point is radically incorrect.¹

Even Delitzsch² fails to support him in the belief that the same Solomonic stamp belongs to i.-xxix. It is true that the first part is connected with the second by similarity of words and expressions. But the majority resolve themselves into imitation. The gifted writer of i. 8-ix drank deep into the spirit of Solomon's proverbs in x. 1-xxii. 16, and therefore his style resembles theirs. Thus xix. 27 may be regarded as the germ out of which arose the hortatory counsels to the son, contained in i.-ix.; and xiv. 1 furnished occasion for the allegory of the wise and foolish women in the ninth chapter. And the first part has many words peculiar to itself, as *מוֹמָה* discretion, prudence, in the singular number, i. 4; iii. 20. *עֲרָמָה* prudence, i. 4; viii. 5, 12. *מְלִיצָה* aphorism, i. 6. *מַעְגַּל* way, ii. 9; iv. 11, 26. *מַעְגֶּלָה* the same, ii. 15, 18; v. 6, 21. *אֵישׁוֹן* apple of the eye, vii. 2, 9. *בִּגְדֵי צוֹרֶת* the throat, i. 9; iii. 3, 21; vi. 21; the verb *אָתָה* to come, i. 27. *כֶּלֶם* to weigh, iv. 26; v. 6, 21. *שָׁמָּה* to deviate, iv. 15; vii. 25. Synonymous words are also accumulated, as *congregation and assembly*, v. 14; *loving hind and pleasant roe*, v. 19; *thy flesh and thy body*, v. 11; *guide, overseer, or ruler*, vi. 7; *in the twilight, in the evening, in the black and dark night*, vii. 9; *pride and arrogancy*, viii. 13; *rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth, and my delights were with the sons of men*, viii. 31; in a way peculiar to this division. Hence we cannot hold with Keil the common authorship of i. 8-ix, and x.-xxii. 16; but believe, with Delitzsch³ and others, that they originated at different times. And that x.-xxii. 16, and xxv.-xxix. betray one source we cannot perceive. Delitzsch has succeeded in shewing that there is much similarity of expression between the two collections, and in proving that several peculiarities of the former division, adduced as such by Ewald, appear also in the latter.⁴ But he fails to explain away the singularity of *אֵשׁ* at the beginning of Proverbs in x.-xxii. 16 (xi. 24; xii. 18; xiii. 7, 23; xiv. 12; xvi. 25; xviii. 24; xx. 15), a phenomenon wholly foreign to the remainder of the book. In like manner, the phrases *מִקּוֹר חַיִּים* x. 11; xiii. 14; xiv. 27; xvi. 22. *עֵץ חַיִּים* xi. 30; xiii. 12; xv. 4. *מִחָתָה* destruction, x. 14, 15; xiii. 3; xiv. 28; xviii. 7; xxi. 15. *יָפִיחַ* xii. 17; xiv. 5, 25; xix. 5, 9. *סֶלָף* xiii. 6; xix. 3; xxi. 12; xxii. 12;

¹ Einleitung, § 117, p. 349, et. seqq. See also in Hävernick's Einleitung, p. 392 et seqq.

² In Herzog, vol. xiv. p. 710.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid, p. 709.

and קִרְיָא xi. 3; xv. 4, cannot be called accidental, but are rather characteristic of the writer; since they do not appear in xxv.-xxix. We admit that many words are common to the two divisions. But the cause does not lie in identity of authorship merely. It should be chiefly sought in imitation. While therefore it is probable that some parts of xxv.-xxix. are the authentic sayings of Solomon, others, and those the most numerous, are of a different origin and later. The ideas, conformation, and character of the proverbs distinguish them from those in x.-xxii. 16. They approach nearer to sayings of the common people.¹

The fifth part containing the words of Agur, (xxx.) is a loose appendix to the preceding. Who Agur was we cannot tell, except that he was probably one of *the wise men*, some of whose sayings are given in other parts of the book. According to the English version, Agur the son of Jakch delivered the precepts to Ithiel and Ucal. Jerome and some Rabbins thought Agur a symbolical name for Solomon. This does not agree with verses 2, 3, 8. The title runs thus in the Hebrew text: דְּבַר־אָגוּר

בֶּן-יִקְהָה הַמִּשְׁאֵה נָאם

can only be translated, "the words of Agur son of Jakeh, the prophecy, the oracle of the man, for Ithiel, for Ithiel and Ucal, for etc." Various things render this reading suspicious. In the first place, no less than three phrases are applied to the same thing viz. *the words of Agur, the prophecy, the oracle*; and secondly, the name *Ithiel* is repeated with *Ucal*. Besides a *meshal* begins with בִּי, a particle that can scarcely be rendered *surely*. The oldest authorities translate the words very differently from the English version. Thus the LXX. have, *τάδε λέγει ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῖς πιστευούσι Θεῷ καὶ παύομαι*, *thus saith the man to them who believe God, and I cease*. The Vulgate has, *Verba congregantis filii Vomentis, visio quam locutus est vir, cum quo est Deus, et qui Deo secum morante confortatus, ait*. Ewald makes אָגוּר and אֶתִּיאֵל, into the symbolical names, *I-am-strong* and *God-with-me*, which were formed by the poet himself. According to this אָגוּר is the first person imperfect of יָגַל, as the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Peshito understand it. But that person is in all other cases אָכַל not אָגַל. Besides, the person spoken to, or for whom the oracle is delivered, is never given elsewhere with נָאם. The peculiarity of בִּי beginning a proverb also remains. We must therefore have recourse to other means of clearing up the text; either by altering the consonants,

¹ Ewald, Die Dichter des alten Bundes, vierter Theil, p. 31 et seqq.

or the vowels, or both. By changing the vowels alone Hitzig, whom Bertheau follows, brings out the sense thus :

דְּבַרִּי אֲגֹר בֶּן־יָקֶהָ מָשָׁא נָאֻם הַנֶּבֶר לְאִתִּי אֵל לְאִתִּי אֵל וְאֵבֶל

The words of Agur son of her obeyed in Massa, thus saith the man, "I have laboured in vain for God, I have laboured in vain for God, and became weak." In this manner a reason is given for what follows, כִּי *for*, etc. He had toiled to find out God, and his strength had failed him through intense longing to reach the object of his striving. The beginning of xxxi. 1, may also be translated, "the words of Lemuel king of Massa, which his mother taught him." Such is the view first proposed by Hitzig in Zeller's Jahrb. (1844).

We object to this ingenious emendation, because בֶּן יָקֶהָ מָשָׁא "the son of her to whom obedience was given in Massa" is bad Hebrew. Making the slight change of מָשָׁא for מְשָׁא we render, "the words of Agur son of Jakch of Massa; the oracle of the man; I am weary, O God, I am weary, O God, and am become weak." In xxxi. 1, the word מָשָׁא is not a proper name, because לְמוֹאֵל מֶלֶךְ מָשָׁא "Lemuel king of Massa" is not Hebrew. To make it good Hebrew מֶלֶךְ should have the article prefixed. The true rendering is, "the words of King Lemuel; the oracle which his mother," etc. According to our version it is not said that Agur was son of the queen of Massa; nor can Lemuel have been a non-reigning brother.

Bunsen takes *Hamassa* as *Hamassai* supposing that *yod* was dropped at the end, and interprets it as a Gentile noun "the man of Massa." The words of Agur, son of Jakeh, the man of Massa. He appeals to the analogous *Dammeseck* in Gen. xv. 2 which he takes as if it were *Dammuski*, the Damascene.¹ But we regard דְּמוֹת דָּמֶשֶׁק there as a gloss inserted by some later interpreter to explain the unintelligible דָּמֶשֶׁק. Without the insertion, the sense is clear, *the son of possession*, i.e., *possessor of my house is Eliezer*. Grammatically, the text as it stands can only mean, *Damascus, a city of Eliezer*; as גִּבְעַת שְׂאוּל (1 Sam. xi. 4) *Gibeah of Saul*, shews.

Where then is the kingdom of *Massa* to be found? The word occurs in Gen. xxv. 14, and 1 Chron. i. 30. It is there associated with *Dumah*, and placed among the Ishmaelite lands or peoples. We are informed in 1 Chron. iv. 39-43 that certain Simeonites went to the district south of Judah, in the time of king

¹ Bibelwerk, I., pp. 178, 179.

Hezekiah; destroyed the inhabitants of it, and settled down in their room; and that 500 Simeonites went to mount Seir, smote the rest of the Amalekites and dwelt there. It is very probable that these Simeonites founded the kingdom of Massa. Hence it was in mount Seir, in the neighbourhood of Dumah¹. It is difficult to tell whether these sayings of Agur are extracts from a larger work; or were found in their present state by him who appended them. We incline to the former view.

The sixth part, chap. xxxi. 1-9 contains the words of Lemuel which his mother is said to have taught him. The name is the older form of Nemuel, Simeon's first-born (1 Chron. iv. 24; Num. xxvi. 12). It is only conjecture that the mother of Lemuel was queen of Massa; and that Agur and Lemuel were brothers. Like Agur, the latter was one of those styled *the wise*. We cannot with Ewald and Keil look upon Lemuel as a symbolical name of Solomon; supposing that לִמְעוּל as it is pointed in the fourth verse, means *to God*, i.e. *devoted to God*.² The contents and titles of the fifth and sixth parts shew that they were drawn from the same source; probably a large collection of the *wise men's sayings*. They shew great similarity, and might be considered as *one* piece of the whole book.

The Septuagint divides xxx. 1-14 from xxx. 15, etc., putting it before xxiv. 23, and xxx. 15-xxx. 9 before xxv. It has also before xxiv. 23 four proverbs which are not in the Hebrew:

- 1 A son that keeps the word shall escape destruction;
And he that receives it, receives Him.
- 2 From no tongue let a lie be spoken against the king,
Since a lie never comes from his tongue.
- 3 The king's tongue is a sword and not one of flesh;
Whosoever shall be delivered to it, will be broken to pieces.
- 4 If his wrath should be kindled, it consumes the nerves of a man,
Devours his bones and burns as a flame,
So that they are inedible by the young eagles.

There are good reasons for believing that these proverbs stood at first in the place they now occupy, and that they were lost out of the Hebrew text by mistake. They are worthy of their position in the book. Hence the verses belong to the division xxii. 17-xxiv, or to the former section of it. There is no reason for doubting that they disappeared from the Hebrew; because the LXX. have preserved many others from the tenth chapter onwards, which are not in our present Hebrew text.

The seventh part, containing the fine poem xxxi. 10-31, is

¹ See Hitzig, *Die Sprüche Salomo's*, page 310 et seqq.

² See Ewald, *Sprüche Salomo's*, *Kohelet*, p. 173.

alphabetical. The author is unknown. In style and subject it is different from the two preceding pieces, and must have been drawn from a different source. Being alphabetical, its origin is comparatively late. In the eyes of Hitzig it exhibits a few expressions sufficient to bring it down to a period after Alexander.¹ If so, Ecclesiastes and it would be nearly contemporary. But there is no good reason for this. Neither diction nor orthography warrants the conclusion. The latest to which it can be referred is the sixth century.

We have thus seen that the contents of the book were composed at different times, beginning with that of Solomon and reaching down till more than three centuries after. One person arranged the various pieces in their present form. The separate collections arose now and again. In the introduction i. 1-7 the compiler says, that he intends to give not only the proverbs of Solomon, but the words of the wise and their dark sayings. This implies that he had xxii. 17-xxiv. in his mind, as well as x.-xxii. 16. The entire work was arranged and completed by one and the same person, in the sixth century, after the return from captivity. Of course different parts had been collected and excerpted by preceding literary men; among the rest chaps. i.-ix. which we cannot, with Bleek,² suppose to have been composed by the final redactor of the whole. The reason why the general title is *Proverbs of Solomon* may lie in the fact that the nucleus of the work is his. *A potiori fit denominatio*. So the book of Psalms is often called *the Psalms of David*; although David did not write them all. Or, if the principle in question does not strictly apply—if the majority of the 746 verses contained in the book be not really Solomon's, analogy comes to our aid and justifies the hypothesis that the sayings of different wise men have been put together with the name of one celebrated author prefixed. Every nation has done so. The Greeks attributed to Pythagoras many golden sayings which proceeded from others. The north assigned to Odin, their wisest king, all its moral precepts. The Arabic sentences of Meidani, Abu Obaid, and Mophaddel are compilations, containing more than belongs to these sages themselves. According to tradition Lokmann is the author of some. Thus the Hebrews appropriated *their* proverbs to Solomon their wisest king, because it was well known that he had excelled in this sort of philosophic poetry.

V. STATE OF THE TEXT.—The text of the book is not in a correct state, having suffered considerably from transcribers and others. The Hebrew, however, is better than the Septuagint;

¹ Die Sprüche Salomo's, p. 334.

² Einleitung, p. 635.

though the latter sometimes supplies the means of obtaining the original reading. The corruption is most apparent in the first part. At the present time it is all but hopeless to arrive at the primary text in many instances. Even the higher criticism fails in the effort. The Septuagint puts the thirtieth and thirty-first chapters before xxiv. 23-xxv. 1: thus, xxiv. 22 (Heb.); xxix. 27-xxx. 1-14; xxiv. 23-34; xxx. 15-33; xxxi. 1-9; xxv. 1, etc. (Heb.). In various cases members, and even whole verses, have been inserted, which must be ejected from the text. At other times, they have dropped out, and must be supplied.

VI. NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PROVERBS GENERALLY, AND OF THE HEBREW PROVERBS IN PARTICULAR.—The use of proverbs has prevailed in all countries. Certain stages of the history of nations are highly favourable to their reception and popularity. When the sciences were little cultivated, and composition had not been subjected to critical refinements, they were readily adopted. Their usefulness is most felt in an unsophisticated state of society, when the modifications of artificial life are few, and the manners of men unaffected. In such circumstances, general rules furnish a safe and easy guidance; because men are neither able nor willing to perplex themselves with minute circumstances, or to seek out cavils. Short and plain directions suffice. In regulating public and private affairs; in correcting the vices and curbing the passions of the multitude, they were often employed with great success. Such proverbial sayings were handed down orally; and were easily remembered because called into constant use. They required no effort or art to impress conviction. Their pointedness made them easily understood; and their brevity secured remembrance. Conciseness is necessary. But the manner of conveying the leading idea is very varied, depending as it does on the taste of the writer. Plainness of expression is generally adopted, because there are no intricacies to be investigated. Occasions, however, arise in which some ornament may be bestowed on them.

The estimation in which this kind of composition was held in ancient times appears from the fact, that proverbs were uttered in oracles, by legislators, by lyric and epic poets. Indeed the title of *wisdom* was appropriated to proverbial instruction. And it deserved the appellation, because it pointed out what man's duty required him to perform, or his highest interest to pursue. Accordingly the moral aphorisms of the seven wise men of Greece have been carefully preserved. But though some collections of proverbial sayings have survived among the Greeks; we have none made by any Roman writer which can lay claim to antiquity and popularity. Eastern nations have many

such collections. They had more genius for aphorisms. The cold logic of the west, and cogent reasoning generally, are unfavourable to their growth. A lively and luxuriant fancy, aided by experience, tends to their multiplication. An advanced civilisation is commonly attended with too much inclination for minute discrimination and subtle distinctions to promote the increase of proverbs. The same may be predicated of reasonings on material laws, or scientific investigations. There are many collections of Arabic proverbs such as those of Meidani, of Abu Obaid, and of the Chaliph Ali. The last approaches nearest in excellence to those of Solomon. The proverbs of Ali were published at Oxford in 1806. Arabian literature is very rich in this kind of composition. The Persians have also collections, one of which was published by De Sacy in 1819, under the title of *Pend Nameh*, "Book of Counsel." The Chinese too have many good proverbs. As to form, it is generally the same among Oriental nations. A sage called *father*, gives his scholar or *son* instructions conveyed in these brief sentences.

The difference between the Hebrew collection contained in this book, and those of other ancient nations is, that a higher tone of morality pervades the former. God is presented to the view as a just and righteous sovereign, in whose fear the highest wisdom consists. In purity of principle the best of the old moralists are far surpassed by the writers whose sayings are incorporated in the work entitled the Proverbs of Solomon. That the present collection consists of excerpts from many sources we may readily assume, because internal evidence sufficiently attests it. They are all preceptive or didactic; such as admit of general application. Those of a historical nature are excluded, as, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" (1 Sam. x. 11). A historical basis is unfavourable to general adaptation. Abstract sentences serve better for instruction.

The Proverbs embody the result of Hebrew reflection at a particular period, or rather at times separated by various intervals. They are ethical maxims, deduced from the Mosaic law and divine providence. Hebrew wisdom is concentrated in them. Sometimes they appear in the form of short unconnected sentences and gnomes; sometimes as connected conversations covering the field of practical life. Piety is presented in its outward aspect. The aphorisms embrace the duty of fear and reverence towards God, justice and benevolence towards man, temperance, industry, prudence, economy, continence, modesty, purity of heart, gentleness of demeanour; precepts relative to the education of the young, the conduct of rulers and subjects. A picture is given of the social condition, mutual relations and dependences, and practical reasonings of the Hebrews in the

age of Solomon, and some time after. What Hebrew men felt and thought on all the great problems relating to a social state, their ordinary moral views, their sense of mutual obligations, are vividly described. All bears the stamp of serious, sober thinking; and shews a tolerably advanced state of civilisation. Such proverbs current among a people, and generally approved, attest a high rank for them among the nations of the world. No code of ethics, formed in any pagan nation equals it in enlightenment, purity, or breadth. The ethics of the book are such as the Jewish dispensation naturally gave rise to. They are not as spiritual as those of the New Testament. Indeed, *religion*, properly so called, is not exhibited. The motives presented are prudential. The encouragements offered to a life of virtue are founded on earthly retribution. The writers had no conception of a future state of rewards and punishments. The love of God is not taught as the great spring of human conduct. The depths of the consciousness of the divine in man are hardly touched by the maxims set forth. Compared with the New Testament morality, that of Proverbs is pitched on a low key. The piety which it is fitted to nourish is not that elevated kind which brings the spirit of man into intimate communion with God and his Son Jesus Christ; or teaches the god-like beauty of virtue, or enforces that virtue for its own sake. The principles of the Mosaic law are not so much developed in the prophets. Perhaps the mind of the nation generally had not sufficiently reflected on the relations of man to his Creator and to his fellow-man, on past revelations of the divine will, or the ways and works of God; else it might have risen much higher—from morals to religion, from interested to unselfish motives, from utilitarianism to spiritualism. There is indeed enough of shrewd reflection and sound common sense embodied. The result of a wide observation and much experience is manifest. All the virtues are inculcated; but the basis on which they are made to rest is naturally Jewish. And what is more, it is not a *high* Jewish one. Pure love and true faith do not enter into its substance. It is *objective* rather than *subjective*. Hence it is ill-fitted to promote a healthy piety which can stand the shock of life's battle. Self, in a higher or lower degree, mixes largely with it. The truth of these remarks might be attested by numerous examples, if it were necessary. Thus it is not once enjoined "to love God." Neither is it commanded "to love our neighbour." In a few instances we find such elevated truths as these—"trust in the Lord with all thine heart," "to do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice," "wait on the Lord and he shall save thee;" but the general tenor is illustrated by, "honour the Lord with

thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thine increase, so shall thy barns be filled with plenty," etc. ; "let thine heart keep my commandments, for length of days and long life and peace shall they add to thee ;" "the fear of the Lord tendeth to life ; and he that hath it shall abide satisfied ; he shall not be visited with evil." Sometimes the admonitions savour of harshness, as in xx. 16, "Take his garment that is surety for a stranger, and because of strangers, distrain him," i.e., force, by seizure, him who has pledged himself on account of strangers. This is an injunction to the creditor to deal severely with a man who has become surety for others. Castigation of slaves is also recommended in xxix. 19, 21. In like manner, the rod is often enjoined for children — "the rod and reproof give wisdom" (xxix. 15).

It is their *peculiar character* which gives them certain imperfections. Proceeding from an age when the spirit of observation was not highly cultivated, they are often too particular, as well as too general. What happens sometimes, is enunciated as a usual thing ; what is common, is stated as universal. The very form gave rise in part to this characteristic, because the endeavour to be *pointed* demanded a condensed emphasis excluding minute modifications. And as they had to be *short*, confined to the compass of a few words, they were often obscure. Ingenuity and art veiled the meaning in part. Their main defect, however, at least of those which are strictly ethical, arises from the old Jewish mode of connecting virtue with prosperity, and vice with adversity. Earthly possessions and enjoyment are freely promised to the virtuous man ; thus,

Riches and honour are with me (wisdom),
Yea, durable riches and righteousness (viii. 18).

By me shall thy days be multiplied,
And the years of thy life shall be increased (ix. 11).

Examples of proverbs which express a thing *generally* that only happens *sometimes* are,

The evil bow before the good,
And the wicked at the gates of the righteous (xiv. 19).

A divine sentence is in the lips of the king ;
His mouth transgresseth not in judgment (xvi. 10).

Even a fool when he holdeth his peace is counted wise ;
And he that shutteth his lips is esteemed a man of understanding (xvii. 28).

All the brethren of the poor do hate him ;
How much more do his friends go far from him, etc. (xix. 7).

What only happens sometimes, is expressed *universally*, as,

The poor useth entreaties ;
But the rich answereth roughly (xviii. 23).

A false witness shall not be unpunished ;
And he that speaketh lies shall perish (xix. 9).

Sometimes things belonging to the domain of nature and duty are brought together as parallels, though their likeness is far-fetched, as,

It is not good to eat much honey ;
So for men to search their own glory is not glory (xxv. 27).

As vinegar to the teeth, and as smoke to the eyes,
So is the sluggard to them that send him (x. 26).

Surely the churning of milk bringeth forth butter,
And the wringing of the nose bringeth forth blood,
So the forcing of wrath bringeth forth strife (xxx. 33).

As might be expected, obscurity often arises from brevity, far-fetched comparisons, or want of definiteness and exactness in one of the parallel members, as,

The ransom of a man's life are his riches ;
But the poor heareth not rebuke (xiii. 8).

Here the second member is obscure, in its connection with the first.

Whoso boasteth himself of a false gift,
Is like clouds and wind without rain (xxv. 14).

As a thorn goeth up into the hand of a drunkard,
So is a parable in the mouth of fools (xxvi. 9).

Here the comparison is far-fetched, and too artificial to be plain. The same may be said of,

Whosoever hideth her (the contentious woman) hideth the wind,
And his right hand catcheth fat (xxvii. 16).

Examples of unimportant and trivial sayings occur in,

He that is despised and hath a servant,
Is better than he that honoureth himself and lacketh bread (xii. 9).

Where no oxen are the crib is clean,
But much increase is by the strength of the ox (xiv. 4).

It is better to dwell in a corner of the housetop,
Than with a brawling woman in a wide house (xxi. 9).

WISDOM AS A PERSON.—There are several passages in which Wisdom is introduced as a person calling upon men to hear her voice and attend to her instructions, promising life to such as obey, and declaring death to those who despise her. Two passages of this nature are more prominent than the rest, viz., i. 20-23, and viii. 1-ix. 12. It is desirable to take them together, and regard the term Wisdom in both as having the same meaning. What then is the idea to be attached to Wisdom in them?

1. Some understand it as our Lord Jesus Christ in his personal presence and ministry. So Gill holds. The ministry of Christ in the days of his flesh is predicted, its success, and the calamities that should come upon the Jews for their rejection of it. It is needless to argue against this hypothesis, because we are not aware of its having found any advocates. It is extreme, and obviously incorrect. Wisdom is described as having been always calling upon men, since their creation. She did not *begin* to call them when Christ appeared in the days of his flesh.

2. The passages in question describe the eternal Word himself, whose being and activity are not limited by time; who both before and since his incarnation is always present with his church; and is always calling the children of men to himself. Nothing in the shape of *argument* has been adduced in favour of this view. One advocate of it, after quoting Proverbs i. 24-28, says, "We are irresistibly led by them to think of the personal God himself;" and that "the spirit," which Wisdom promises to pour out, is "beyond all question the Holy Spirit." How does this prove Wisdom to be the second person in the Trinity? The great and fatal objection to the hypothesis is, that Wisdom was not *hypostatized* so early as the Book of Proverbs. The doctrine of the Trinity lies obscurely in Hebraism. It contains the threefold idea of God as the highest Being presiding over the world, as revealing Himself in it, and as the Spirit who works in all. The clear conception of this second abstraction as a *being* or *person*, did not take place till much later. Even in the Book of Sirach, wisdom is merely personified (i. 1-10; xxiv. 8-10; vii. 22, etc.) It is indeed regarded not merely as a *form* but a *substance*—a power forming all things—yet not a *person*. In the Book of Wisdom too, wisdom is not *hypostatized*. And in neither is Chochmah (wisdom) put into connection with the idea of Messiah. In his great work on the history of the development of the doctrine respecting Christ's person Dorner¹ fully admits that the passage

¹ *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, Erster Theil, p. 18, Zweite Auflage.*

in Proverbs under consideration, does not proceed as far as the *hypostatizing* of wisdom. Even the *messenger* or *angel of Jehovah* (מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה) is not in the Old Testament books a constant *personal hypostasis*; but either a personification or creature. He is not presented as a *definite personality*, distinct from the company of angels on the one hand and not losing himself in the personality of Jehovah, on the other. The idea of the *angel of Jehovah* is a varying one. Where he is a mere personification of Jehovah, *wisdom* in the book of Proverbs is the equivalent.¹ To say then that wisdom is described as a person, or adumbrated as such in Proverbs, is to betray a misconception of the doctrine of Hebraism relating to the point in which development had advanced but a little. We may safely affirm that no Hebrew thought of Wisdom as a real, personal Being when the Proverbs were written, simply because the doctrine of the Trinity was not then developed. The Father alone, as God, was the object of worship by the Jews of that time. All that the Proverbs afford is a *point of transition* for the later conception of wisdom hypostatized.

3. Wisdom is a poetic personification of the attribute of divine wisdom as manifested in the outward revelations of nature and providence, or in the inward revelations of conscience.

The entire description of wisdom in i., viii., ix., agrees best with this view. Let one read over viii. 1-11 and say, whether any thing more was intended by the writer: "Doth not wisdom cry? and understanding put forth her voice?" Here the parallelism is obvious. Hence many, feeling the impropriety of referring these eleven verses to the Divine Logos or second person in the Trinity, suppose that the twelfth verse commences the description of the eternal hypostatic word; what precedes being an elegant personification of wisdom in the abstract. There is no proper point of separation at the verse in question. The description should be taken as a whole (viii. 1-ix. 12).

The advocates of the second interpretation usually concentrate their arguments on viii. 22-31, because these verses are apparently most favourable to it. And they contend that an attribute cannot be the *beginning*, origin, or efficient cause of God's operation in the work of creative power (ver. 22). This argument rests on the supposition that רֵאשִׁית בְּרֵכוֹ is not only in apposition with the suffix of the preceding verb, but bears an active sense, equivalent to ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ (Rev. iii. 14). That, however, is foreign to the scope of the context.

¹ Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre, etc., p. 17.

The words should be rendered "as the beginning of his way;" meaning that wisdom was born before all things. It is farther said, that an attribute cannot be *born* (24, 25). The word means properly, *brought forth*, and must be *figuratively* applied, whether the second person of the Trinity or the attribute of wisdom is meant; because *the divine nature alone* of the former can be spoken of. Holden indeed says, that it expresses the *divine eternal generation* of the Son;¹ language to us unintelligible. Still farther, an attribute cannot be *by* or *near* the Deity (30). Why not? With great propriety may wisdom be figuratively described as a personage, and represented as *with* the Deity. It is also alleged, that it cannot rejoice in his sight (30). Very naturally and beautifully is wisdom poetically described as his darling child from eternity, exulting in the presence of Jehovah. Again, wisdom as an attribute "cannot be called the fabricator of the world." But *artificer* (ver. 30) is a most appropriate epithet.

There is nothing in the entire passage which does not suit a poetic illustration of divine wisdom. Being set forth as a personage she had a beginning. Hence she is called the *firstling* or *first creation* of God's formative power, because all works were performed by her aid. As the firstling, her *birth* may be predicated. She is the Deity's inseparable associate; rejoices in his immediate presence; is the artificer of the world. She was *anointed* from everlasting (23); set apart and ordained to her high, royal calling. Thus the poetic drapery in which Wisdom is portrayed is both significant and suitable. It is easy to find passages in the New Testament which speak of Christ in very similar language; especially in John's Gospel. Christ was the *impersonation* of perfect wisdom; and it was therefore natural to apply to him the poetical epithets employed in the Old Testament to describe Wisdom as a figurative person. Indeed such analogy was almost unavoidable, because Christianity was developed out of Judaism. We know what is often said about revelation being "an indivisible whole having from first to last the same eternal Spirit for its author;" and being "a progressive work in which the earlier parts continually shadow forth some higher good things to come." This is *not* a true idea of revelation: men inspired by the Spirit of God were the authors of different parts of revelation; men neither gifted alike nor infallible. The written parts of revelation are indeed progressive; but one often supersedes another. If revelation be progressive, why put into the earlier parts of it the things *characteristic* of the later? *Anticipations* of doctrines are not of necessity the doctrines

¹ Attempt towards an improved translation of the Proverbs of Solomon, p. 162 et seqq.

themselves. Because the eternal Logos is revealed in the New Testament, we ought not, *on that account*, to find him revealed in Hebraism. The question is one of exegesis not of general assertion. We admit that comprehensive views of Hebraism and Judaism are important towards its solution; but these must be taken from *previous examination of the Old Testament* itself, rather than from preconceived notions of inspiration.

Various expressions in the paragraph appear to us inconsistent with the interpretation which refers wisdom to the second person of the Trinity. The twenty-second verse says, "Jehovah created me." It does not mean *to possess*, as the English Bible has it, after the Vulgate. In fact the verb never means *to possess* simply and solely, but always indicates *the act of coming into possession*. All good Hebrew scholars translate it *create*—Gesenius, Ewald, Hitzig, Bertheau, Fürst, Umbreit, Elster, with the LXX., Targum, and Peshito. That this is the true meaning of קָנָה is plain enough from the context, the words ראשית דרכו signifying *as the beginning of his way*, confirming it; for they relate to the origination of wisdom. If the passage refers to the Son, he must be a created being, as the Arians maintain. We can understand what sense belongs to *he created me*, if wisdom be a mere poetical personification. It is figurative, signifying that all true wisdom is an emanation from God himself. It is as it were his *offspring* or production. In vain do the adherents of an effete orthodoxy try to shew that the verb means here *to possess* or *obtain* me. How? Holden affirms, "possessed me by right of paternity and generation. The Father possessed the Son—had, or as it were, acquired him by an eternal generation." It is impossible to say what these words mean. Another says, *he possessed or obtained me* "not by a literal generation of substance any more than by a literal creation of substance. We have to do here with a relation that is altogether superhuman, and which is moreover expressed, not in dry, didactic propositions, but in the loftiest strains of poetry, the writer employing finite human relations to shadow forth that which is divine and infinite. From these earthly images we must subtract all that is material and temporal, leaving only the pure relation itself in its infinity and eternity." This is no intelligible answer to the question, "How, *possessed me*." In fact the word, even if rendered by *possessed* or *obtained*, is quite unsuitable to the relation between the first and second persons of the Trinity. The primary idea of the verb *viz. getting or obtaining* is inapplicable, because it implies *origin*, a time when wisdom was not; for *possessed*, if such be the sense,

means nothing but *to get possession*; or to *possess* what one has obtained. Thus either version, *created* or *possessed*, is opposed to the proper relation of the second person in the Trinity to the first. The verb לָּבַן *born* explains *created*, and also disagrees with the reference of wisdom to the eternal Logos; for how could a divine nature be born? If it be said that it expresses his "divine and eternal generation," the explanation is utterly unintelligible.

The whole passage has no relation to the doctrine of the Trinity. It contains nothing more than a bold personification of the antiquity, excellence, and dignity of wisdom. An allegorical personage is presented to the reader. The feminine gender would not be employed to set forth the second person in the Trinity; for the matter is more than one of mere grammatical form. Wisdom is represented as a female, SHE: shewing a simple personification. In short it may be confidently asserted, that the passage contains nothing about the internal relations of the godhead. It does not allude either to the development of the divine οὐσία or ὑπόστασις.

We leave the advocates of the ultra-orthodox view, now obsolete among scholars, to vindicate the description, understood in their way, from the charge of *bitheism*. "When wisdom," says Holden, "is represented as rejoicing in his sight, does it not naturally lead us to think of a distinct person?"¹ A *distinct* person violates the divine unity. We allow of a distinction in the divine nature, but not of *distinct* persons, one rejoicing in the presence of the other from eternity. But such as cannot separate *names* from *things* will still adhere to current phraseology, and continue to gather their precarious proofs of *distinct* persons from this paragraph and others, to the manifest detriment of their cause among all who have either the ability or courage to think. We submit that *eternal relations* would be less objectionable than *distinct persons*.

VIII. CANONICAL AUTHORITY.—The canonical authority of the book is attested by quotations in the New Testament, of which the following is a list:

Prov. i. 16	Rom. iii. 15.
„ iii. 7	„ xii. 16.
„ iii. 11, 12	Heb. xii. 5, 6.
„ iii. 34	James iv. 6.
„ x. 12	1 Peter iv. 8.
„ xi. 31	„ iv. 17, 18.

¹ Attempt, etc., etc., p. 186.

Prov. xvii. 13	1 Peter iii. 9; Rom. xii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 15.
„ xvii. 27	James i. 19.
„ xx. 9	1 John i. 8.
„ xx. 20	Matt. xv. 4.
„ xx. 22	Rom. xii. 17.
„ xxv. 21, 22	„ xii. 20.
„ xxvi. 11	2 Peter ii. 22.
„ xxvii. 1	James iv. 13, etc.

THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES.

I. CONTENTS.—Chap. i.-iv. 16. After the title of the book (ver. 1) and its leading design to shew that all is vanity (ver. 2) are given, the writer proceeds at once to illustrate his theme. The ceaseless course of things is repeated, so that nothing new is presented—nothing that does not revolve in a circle, proving the vanity of every thing earthly (i. 3-11). Out of his own experience the writer points out the vanity of endeavouring to obtain enduring and satisfying good by mentioning three ways he had taken to arrive at peace, viz., devoting himself to the philosophy of history so to speak, or a search into everything that takes place under the sun (12-18); by descending from the height of spiritual contemplation into the waves of sensual pleasures (ii. 1, 2); and lastly, by connecting wisdom and folly, or in other words, reason and sensuality, the latter being placed under the guidance of the former. This last is the way of prudence (ii. 3-11). The preacher now looks back at the two leading experiments he had made. Here he finds that wisdom is better than folly; yet he is still grieved to find that both are alike subject to forgetfulness; and that his successor's folly may reverse his wisdom (12-16). Since then wisdom has the same issue as folly, he determines to enjoy the present. Eating, drinking, and such like, are the best things one can do—the gift of God to man (17-26). The third chapter represents human actions and affairs as happening at appointed times; and all their vicissitudes being regulated by certain fixed laws which man cannot change; therefore the enjoyment of life is the best thing (iii. 1-15). Injustice and oppression prevail among men; yet they endure only for a time, and are amenable to the divine judgment in this life. From such evils men may see their end to be like that of the beasts; and consequently present enjoyment is still to be followed (iii. 16-22). At the beginning of the fourth chapter, the writer resumes the idea of iii. 16, praising the dead above the living because of the injustice practised

on earth, and preferring him that is not born to both. While toiling and striving after wealth men are often envied by one another; idleness is self-destructive; quietness is better; and a social life highly advantageous (iv. 4-12). The vanity of kingly dignity is touched upon (iv. 13-16).

Chap. iv. 17-xii. 8.—Cohelah now instructs the reader in what way he may best worship God in such circumstances (iv. 17-v. 6). This piece is very loosely connected with what precedes and follows, though Umbreit vainly tries to shew its congruity with the context. The preacher uses new arguments to calm the mind of him who is agitated by witnessing injustice and oppression (v. 7, 8). He now returns to the consideration of the vanity attaching to the pursuit of riches, shewing that the covetous can have no satisfaction; nor such tranquillity as the industrious poor. To enjoy the fruits of labour is the best thing, for riches are vanity (v. 9-vi. 9). The author reverts to the question respecting man's real good, repeating that there is an established order of things beyond human control. It is the duty of a wise man to exhibit patience in adversity (vi. 10-12). The beginning of the seventh chapter has but a loose connexion with what precedes, as Knobel has well observed; though Umbreit tries to shew its sequence in idea. The preacher gives utterance to a number of general observations drawn from common life and experience. He recommends a good name, mortification, patience (vii. 1-14). A due regard for divine providence is also recommended. If the good perish and the wicked enjoy prosperity, man should not be unduly moved nor too severe in judging others, because none is free from faults. The method of wisdom is moderation, which gives strength and power to the wise man. If others speak rashly and in malediction, they should not be heeded, because one may be conscious that he is not innocent himself (vii. 15-22). The writer relates what he found by a repeated pursuit of wisdom (vii. 23-29).

In the eighth chapter obedience to rulers is inculcated, while the oppressed are referred to the unavoidable judgment of God which shall come even upon the transgressor on the throne; only they must patiently wait for the right time. Yet it is always a stumbling block that both to the good and bad a lot happens contrary to their character. Hence a man should enjoy the good things of the present life (viii. 1-15). When Cohelah found that man could not understand or explore the method of divine providence in regulating human affairs, he perceived that he was bound by necessary and immutable laws. The only thing certain for all was death. The troubles of life are increased by wickedness and folly. Yet inasmuch

as the dead are without hope of resuming life, a very wretched existence on earth is preferable to death. Hence he exhorts man to enjoy the good things of this world, which are his portion (viii. 16-ix. 10). Wisdom alone is not sufficient to procure happiness; for it often happens that the wise are hindered from acting wisely. Then folly opposes wisdom, whose excellence is not always acknowledged. As to folly even a little of it ruins many good things. Yet folly, though more influential, is not to be commended. Rather should one act wisely in all circumstances; for example if a ruler should chance to be angry with one, the latter should yield. It is of no use to take it ill that mean men are exalted to high places, and princes brought down low. To strive against this is vain. Foolish and rash words are particularly hurtful to him who employs them. Though gluttonous and slothful rulers cause great evil, care should be taken to say nothing against them (ix. 11-x. 20). One should be prepared for all things which come in the order of providence. He who is ever searching and hesitating about doing, will never prosper; wherefore man should be active in what is useful, enjoying the present as knowing that days of sorrow will come. This leads Coheleth to exhort young men to rejoice in the participation of present delights, remembering however their judge, before the sorrows of old age come upon them (xi. 1-xii. 8).

The epilogue gives a brief account of Coheleth, and concludes with an exhortation to the reader to attend to his instructions without perusing other books, repeating the precept before inculcated, viz., that a man should fear God and keep his commandments (xii. 9-14).

II. MEANING OF COHELETH.—The word קהלת designates Solomon, as is evident from i. 1-12. But why was it applied to him? What is its meaning? Here opinions are greatly divided. Gesenius adopts the signification given by the earliest versions such as the Septuagint and Vulgate, *a preacher*, one addressing a public assembly and discoursing of human things (Septuagint Ἐκκλησιαστής, Vulgate, *Ecclesiastes*). The feminine termination is not infrequent in words denoting office, station, etc., as פִּקְחָה, כְּנִיָּה, also in later Hebrew proper names such as סִפְרָת (Neh. vii. 57) פִּכְרֵת (Ezra ii. 57). From being an abstract designation of office it is thus transferred to the person who fills the office. This explanation appears to us philologically and exegetically untenable. קהלת cannot mean *preaching* as an abstract noun; nor can it be converted into the concrete *preacher*. Hence we differ from Gesenius, Knobel, and Keil.

The word is a feminine participle with an active sense, viz.,

gathering together a circle of hearers and rivetting their attention. The noun *wisdom* is understood (חֵכְמָה)—wisdom which has the power of gathering and keeping together a circle of hearers. It is this Wisdom which preaches in the public places, speaking excellent things to the sons of men (Prov. viii. 1, etc.). Wisdom was personified in Solomon, according to the later Jews; and therefore as the embodiment of it, he teaches and preaches in the Book of Wisdom. Thus the term becomes a proper name, as applied to Solomon the wise. In vain does Keil object to this explanation, affirming that it does not suit the inscription i. 1, nor i. 12, xii. 9, 10. The objection is nothing, because קְהֵלָת is *Solomon*, the impersonation of wisdom. It is not *abstract* and *absolute* wisdom, but Solomon possessing wisdom in the concrete. Coheleth is a person in whom wisdom dwells, not *wisdom absolute* but the wisdom of the day. Hence Stuart's arguments against our view are beside the mark. Wisdom is not personified here as elsewhere. She is personified in another individual, not in and by herself. But is it necessary that the personification should be the same here as in Proverbs? Is it necessary that there should be express intimations of it to the reader as in the older work? Certainly not, because the writer adopts the fiction of making Solomon utter the wisdom of the time, or at least his own experiences and reflections. When Stuart argues against the interpretation given of Coheleth, that wisdom is introduced as making strenuous efforts to acquire itself, and does actually acquire itself with success (i. 16, 17; ii. 12), as remaining with itself (ii. 9), and yet being far away from wisdom, and too deep and remote to be understood (vii. 23, 24), as altogether vanity (ii. 15, 16), as exerting itself most strenuously to find out itself, but being unable to do it (viii. 16, 17), he mistakes the point, because Coheleth is not the incarnation of *abstract* wisdom, but the person Solomon giving expression to the wisdom of the writer and his day—its efforts, researches, and results. He was not a preacher directly and in the first instance. He could not have been so designated at once by קְהֵלָת signifying, *a preaching one*. It could only be applied to him through קְהֵלָת as an attribute of *wisdom*. His fame for *wisdom* was spread abroad among the nations. The explanation now given agrees well with the fact that קְהֵלָת is used with the masculine gender (i. 1, 2; xii. 9, 10), with the article and without it (xii. 8-10). The passage in which it occurs with the feminine (vii. 27) is no exception to the general rule, since the ה of אִמְרָה properly belongs to the following word, אֶמֶר.

Others, as Grotius, Herder, and Jahn, incorrectly

interpret the word *a collector* of sayings and sentiments, συναθροιστής. The verb קָהַל does not refer to the gathering together of *things*, but *persons*. In like manner, Paulus, Bauer, Nachtigall, and Bertholdt err in explaining the word by *assembly* or *society*, as the book contains sayings either brought before an assembly of wise Israelites in reality, or fictitiously represented as such. The consessus of Haririus present an analogy to this; and the traditional סֵעֶרָ at the court of Hezekiah. But though the oriental philosophers were accustomed to hold meetings at certain times, when they interchanged their thoughts on important subjects, partly in writing and partly in conversation, there is no evidence for believing that periodical meetings of learned men were held at the court of Solomon. The monarch was not usually occupied so usefully.

III. AUTHORSHIP AND AGE.—Solomon is never named as the writer, even in the inscription of the book. The commencing words are, “the words of the preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem,” which are certainly meant to point out Solomon. But in i. 12, we read “I the preacher *was* king over Israel in Jerusalem,” which is not very accurate, if Solomon were the author of the book. Why specify *at Jerusalem*, when in Solomon’s time there was no king besides in Judea? Does not the phrase imply that the writer knew of kings over Israel *at Samaria*? He must therefore have lived after the separation of the kingdom into two. In like manner not a few sentiments and expressions are such as Solomon could not have uttered without great incongruity. Thus we read, “I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem; yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge,” and “I made me great works; I builded me houses; I planted me vineyards; I made me gardens and orchards, and I planted trees in them of all kinds of fruits: I made me pools of water, to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees; I got me servants and maidens, and had servants born in my house; and I had great possessions of great and small cattle above all that were in Jerusalem before me; I gathered me also silver and gold, and the peculiar treasure of kings and of the provinces; I gat me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts. So I was great, and increased more than all that were before me in Jerusalem: also my wisdom remained with me,” etc. (i. 9; ii. 4, etc.) Such boastful descriptions drawn out minutely hardly consist with Solomon himself. Nor could Solomon speak thus of his suc-

cessor Rehoboam : " And who knoweth whether he shall be a wise man or a fool ? Yet shall he have rule over all my labour wherein I have laboured and wherein I have shewed myself wise under the sun " (ii. 19). The writer generally, as far as he allows us glimpses of his time, leads us to infer that it was an unprosperous one, when justice and judgment were perverted, and iniquity prevailed : " And, moreover, I saw under the sun the place of judgment that wickedness was there, and the place of righteousness that iniquity was there. So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun, and behold the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter ; and on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they had no comforter " (iii. 16 ; iv. 1). In another passage he writes : " If thou seest the oppression of the poor, and violent perverting of judgment and justice in the province (Judea, then a province of the Persian empire), marvel not at the matter," etc. (v. 8). Solomon's experience of countries was not extensive. On the contrary, it was confined very much to Judea, the land over which he himself reigned. Hence these references look like a libel on himself and his reign, if proceeding from his own pen. Had he not the power and willingness to put a stop to such unjust and iniquitous procedure in public affairs ? " There is an evil," writes he, " which I have seen under the sun, as an error which proceedeth from the ruler : folly is set in great dignity, and the rich sit in low place. I have seen servants upon horses, and princes walking as servants upon the earth " (x. 5-7). Surely this implies that the writer had not the power to rectify such inequalities. His age, too, was evidently one of literary and religious culture, as is involved in xii. 7, where the writing of many books is spoken of. We must therefore conclude that the author made a distinction between himself and Solomon. Hence he says plainly, " the preacher was a wise man, besides he taught the people knowledge, he gave good heed and sought out and set in order many proverbs. He sought to find out acceptable words, and rightly to set down in writing words of truth," language descriptive of the wise man introduced ; but which Solomon would not have employed in speaking of himself. The author lived at a much later period than Solomon, and introduced him as the speaker, by a fiction. The better to set forth his own reflections, they are put into the mouth of the king whose fame for wisdom was the greatest among the Israelites. The literature of the Hebrews presents other examples of such fictions ; and therefore the present case is not singular. The writer is at no particular pains to conceal the outward dress in which he clothes his ideas. The veil he puts on is thin and easily seen through. He is not anxious

about much art in the disguise. Hence the deception is an innocent one, requiring only a small measure of acumen to perceive it. The method adopted could not lead astray any attentive or intelligent reader.¹ That Solomon himself could so think, and so speak about himself, is an idea which Coheleth neither wished nor believed others to entertain, because the personation is very inartificial and imperfect. He even drops at times the first person, and uses the third (vii. 27; xii. 9, 10). The character of the historical Solomon is badly sustained. Yet the Rabbins and older theologians considered Solomon himself the author. Grotius, with true critical instinct, regarded the book as *scriptum serius sub Salomonis nomine*, and was followed by all good interpreters. The fetters of an antiquated tradition still bound writers like Van der Palm, Schelling, Welte, and Scholz, which is not surprising, any more than that Englishmen generally unquestioningly abide by the Solomonic authorship in the face of clear evidence to the contrary. That evidence consists not merely of the internal notices already pointed out, but the character of the language, which is late and Aramaeising. Thus the abstract forms arising from the additions וַת and וַן are late, as סכלות (i. 17; ii. 3, etc.), שפלות (x. 18), שחרות (xi. 10), הוללות (x. 13), יתרון (ii. 13), כשרון (ii. 21), חסרון (i. 15). The contraction אלו (vi. 6), תבן (iv. 12; vi. 10), במל (xii. 3), כָּשֶׁר to prosper or succeed (xi. 6), מרינה (ii. 8), פֶּשֶׁר (viii. 1), שלט (ii. 19), שלטין (viii. 4), תקף (vi. 10), מה־שׁ (i. 9; iii. 15, etc.), גומץ (x. 8), the frequent rejection of א in אשר as in בשל (viii. 17) are Aramaean. So א for ה in ישנא (viii. 1). So is the form מדע (x. 20), and the plural מעטים (v. 1). The word פתגם (viii. 11) is of Persian origin. The words שרה (ii. 8), רחק (xii. 6) are partly Arabic; while בטל (xii. 3) is both Arabic and Syriac. There are even Talmudic expressions, as ענין (i. 13), כבר (ii. 16), בן-חורים (x. 17), חוץ except (ii. 25), מלאה pregnant (xi. 5). The name יהוה does not appear, but everywhere Elohim. The latter occurs no less than thirty-nine times. Yet Jehovah is the prevailing appellation in Malachi. Why the writer abstained from using יהוה is not clear. Was it from the incipient aversion of the later Jews to utter so sacred a name? The reason could not arise from the theme, as Hengstenberg supposes. The language most resembles that of Esther and Daniel. Though the argument founded on the nature of the diction be irresistible

¹ See Ewald, *Kohelet*, p. 189, et seqq.

to all true critics, we need not wonder at its being cavilled at and contradicted by persons ignorant of the various phases which the Hebrew language presented at different periods. Hence such erroneous statements as the following: "it can neither be proved that the author of the Ecclesiastes has used words or phrases which are not pure Hebrew, nor, if it could, would it be conclusive evidence against ascribing it to the royal son of David." Again, "Chaldaisms in fact supply no sure criterion to determine the late origin of a work in which they are found, for Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic having emanated from one common source, the higher we ascend, the greater will be the resemblance."¹ To the same effect writes Preston: "The Chaldee, Arabic, and Hebrew, having all emanated from the same source, it is manifestly impossible to pronounce with certainty, on a word occurring in so confessedly an ancient book as Ecclesiastes, that it belongs to either of the two former, and not to the latter, because the farther we trace these dialects back, the greater will be their similarity; and even supposing some of the words to be foreign and Aramaic, Solomon may easily have acquired them through his constant intercourse with the neighbouring nations, or from his foreign wives, especially as this book was written late in life."²

In opposition to these curious assertions, it must be maintained, that the argument derived from the late character of the Hebrew, and from the Chaldaisms, is good and conclusive. It may be that Knobel³ and others have found too many modern Hebrew expressions and Chaldaisms in the book; and that his examples need the sifting to which Herzfeld has subjected them. Yet though the list of the latter be accepted—eleven to fifteen expressions and constructions foreign to the older literature, and eight to ten Chaldaisms⁴—a list certainly too small, it is sufficient to attest the lateness of the work.

Marks of acquaintance with earlier writings are observable here and there, as at v. 15, compared with Job i. 21; vii. 28 with Job ix. 3. In like manner Jeremiah seems to have been in his mind in certain passages, as vi. 10 and vii. 24, compared with Jer. xvii. 9. Phrases and words have been taken from the Proverbs, such as בעל כנף *a bird*, x. 20; Prov. i. 17. חבק ידים iv. 5; Prov. vi. 10; xxiv. 33. מרפא *tranquillity*, x. 4; Prov. xiv. 30; xv. 4. עצלה x. 18; Prov. xix. 15. תענוגות

¹ Holden, Attempt to illustrate the book of Ecclesiastes, preliminary dissertation, p. xii.

² The Hebrew Text and a Latin translation of the book of Solomon, called Ecclesiastes, etc., pp. 7, 8.

³ Commentar, Einleitung, p. 69, et seqq.

⁴ Kohleth uebersetzt und erlaeutert, Charakter des Buches, §§ 4, 5.

ii. 8; Prov. xix. 10; Song of Sol. vii. 7. This acquaintance with the rich literature of his forefathers must have deepened the author's dissatisfaction with his own times, and tended to produce his unfavourable judgment on the state of the world in general. The rich wisdom and valuable writings of the olden time contrasted most favourably with the poverty that distinguished his own in poetry, wisdom, self-reliance, elasticity, and prosperity. The former spirit of the nation had degenerated. Its independence had evaporated; its history ceased to be worth recording. The tone is that of one who had ceased to hope for the future greatness and glory of his nation. The old writings breathed a spirit which could not be reproduced; and all that the author borrows from them comes unconsciously from what they left in his mind.

In accordance with the diction is the general style of the book, which is mean, inelegant, and prosaic, possessing little of the true poetical character even in the structure of the periods. Yet it has a sort of rhetorical and dialectic turn, which elevates it slightly above mere prose. But there is no rhythmical series of strophes, as Koester and Vaihinger have attempted to prove. The outward form of ideas shews no such careful arrangement and consecution on the part of the writer. Parallelism appears irregularly and seldom. The flow of discourse can only reach it with difficulty. From its similarity to Proverbs, the work is indeed poetical. But the old spirit of Hebrew poetry had become extinct; and much of the poetical character it possesses arises from the nature of the subject, which is didactic, philosophical, and partly *gnomological*. The Hebrews rank *Cheleth* among the poetical books, which they have done from its resemblance to Proverbs and supposed Solomonic authorship. It is imbued with a philosophy unfavourable to high religious inspiration. The style is flat, unworthy of the age of Solomon. It is only at the beginning and close (i. 2-11; xi. 8-xii. 8) that the language rises to a higher elevation, and looks like that of genuine poetry.¹

The position of the book furnishes another argument against its Solomonic authorship. If the collectors of the canonical books had considered it Solomon's, they would not have given it a place between Lamentations and Esther, away from the writings belonging to Solomon's age. It stands immediately before books of the post-exile period. The fact that the author issues his work under the name of a sage celebrated in antiquity, attests the lateness of the period at which he wrote; just as the authors of Daniel's prophecies and the Wisdom of Solomon betray their age by the same procedure.

¹ See Ewald, *Die Dichter des alten Bundes*, vol. iv. p. 194.

If these observations be correct, the book cannot have been composed before the exile. Yet the Talmudists seem to have thought so. In *Baba Bathra* f. 15. c. 1, we read, "Hezekiah and his associates wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs, and *Cohemoth*." Here the verb *to write* (כָּתַב) appears at first sight to mean, *the collecting or redaction* of the book, were it not for the context, where the same verb is manifestly employed to signify *write* as an author, or *write down* for the first time. It is wrong to restrict the word, with Ginsburg, to *final editorship*, excluding all authorship. When it is said that "Moses wrote his book" does it mean no more than that he *finally edited* the Pentateuch? So too R. Gedaliah in *Shalsheleth Hakkabalah*, f. 66, 6, says: "Isaiah wrote his own book, and Proverbs, and the Song of Songs, and *Cohemoth*," Isaiah having been thought the leading person in the learned society of Hezekiah's time. Such Rabbinical traditions are of no value.

Schmidt thinks that *Cohemoth* wrote in the period between Manasseh and Hezekiah. In favour of this he relies upon internal evidence. So also Jahn believes, who extends the time of composition from Manasseh to the end of the kingdom of Judah. But Bertholdt has shewn the hypothesis to be baseless.

Attempts have been made to discover from internal evidence at what particular part of the Persian period the book originated, supposing it no later. That the rulers of the land were incapable, drunken, indolent, corrupt, low-born, is plain from various passages, such as x. 1, 18, 19; vii. 1-7. That the poor were oppressed and justice perverted seems to follow from v. 7, etc. But we cannot say that these references point unmistakeably to the Persian satrapy in Palestine, as it existed under Pseudo-Smerdis, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes. This assertion however is hazarded by Hengstenberg and Keil, who relying on the allusions we have just mentioned to the deep degradation of the ruling nation, adduce in addition various points of contact between *Cohemoth* and Malachi, and an erroneous hypothesis respecting the closing of the canon in the reign of Artaxerxes. It is affirmed that the spirit of formalism, self-righteousness, incipient Pharisaism appear in Malachi and Ecclesiastes. Priestism prevailed. A thirst for justice against the heathen was entertained. Dead orthodoxy could not overcome living selfishness. A comparison is made between such passages as vii. 16 and Mal. iii. 7; v. 3-5 and Mal. i. 8, 14. Discontent with the divine arrangements also appears in Mal. ii. 17, and deep-seated avarice in iii. 8. The dialogistic form in which sentiments are propounded is also said to have a parallel in Malachi, and therefore to indicate contemporaneous origin. We confess however that such considerations furnish precarious

proof of the exact time when Ecclesiastes was written. They do not in our opinion fix it to the life of Nehemiah, or the last years of Artaxerxes. In fact, many critics seek for too special allusions in the general sentiments of Coheleth. Hengstenberg errs greatly in this respect. Kaiser was extravagant and absurd in finding the lives of the kings of David's house from Solomon to Zedekiah described in a veiled form. That Ecclesiastes was written later than Malachi appears from the character of the language. The strongly Aramaean colouring of it seems to forbid so early a date as 400 B.C. The language must have been *purser* and *better* then, as the book of Malachi itself shews. This is confirmed by the circumstance that the view given in Malachi of the priest as *the messenger of the Lord* (מלאך יהוה) had so incorporated itself into the phraseology when Ecclesiastes was written, as to drop the יהוה or אלהים and become simply מלאך. Judging from the diction the beginning of the Macedonian period seems the most likely for its origin. The views of the Pharisees and Sadducees were fermenting in the minds of the thoughtful, but undeveloped. Literary fictions appeared at that time, but hardly so early as Nehemiah, except the case of Deuteronomy. Rosenmüller, Ewald, Knobel, and De Wette are correct in placing the book at the conclusion of the Persian period, about 335 B.C. With this alone agree all its internal phenomena; whereas another spirit began to appear early in the Grecian period, as the book of Esther shews. Its position before the latter, among the Hagiographa, goes to confirm the same opinion. Bleek¹ inclines to put it in the age of the Syrian supremacy of Judea, which seems to us a very doubtful conjecture.

Not very different is the view of Zirkel, Bergst, and Bertholdt, who put its origin considerably after Alexander, but before Antiochus Epiphanes. Perhaps this is too late. The arguments adduced for it, such as Græcisms and antagonistic references to the Pharisees and Sadducees have been invalidated by Bertholdt himself. And if we believe that this origin is too late, that assigned by Hartmann is still more so, viz., the Maccabean period. Its appearance during the Maccabean struggles for national freedom and religion would have been an anomaly in history. A philosophical work would hardly have been produced amid the terrible scenes then passing.

Hitzig endeavours to prove that it belongs to the year 204 B.C. The process by which he brings out this conclusion is ingenious, but highly artificial. His judgment is at fault here. His error arises from discovering *specific* historical allusions in

¹ Einleitung in das alte Testament, p. 643.

the author's general reflections, as in fixing the term יָד (x. 16) upon Ptolemy v. Epiphanes, fifteen years of age at his father's death. As Hahn has refuted Hitzig in his argumentation respecting the date, it is unnecessary to prove its groundlessness.

It appears to us that Ecclesiastes was written in Palestine. Jerusalem seems to have been the writer's home, for he speaks of "the house of God," "the place of the holy," and "the city," as familiar objects (v. 1; viii. 10). We do not think with Ewald, that the proverbial expression in x. 15 implies his abode in some country town of Palestine rather than the metropolis. The Wisdom of Solomon which bears most analogy to Coheleth, was an Egyptian production, written in Greek, in the name of Solomon also, in whom wisdom is represented as personified.

The epilogue (xii. 9-14) has been pronounced unauthentic by Doederlein, Schmidt, Bertholdt, Umbreit, and Knobel. But there is no good reason for thinking that it proceeded from any other than the author of the work, who separates himself from the wise preacher he had fictitiously introduced, testifying that he was a teacher of wisdom who had also written down his instructions for the good of the people. The use of the third person in speaking of Coheleth is not unexampled, for we find the same in vii. 27. Neither language nor ideas clash with the body of the work. But as Knobel's arguments have been well refuted by Herzfeld, they need not be dealt with again. The ninth verse is supposed by this Jewish critic to favour the hypothesis of the epilogue having been a later addition from the writer's own hand; which is unnecessary. The author speaks of the fictitious personage he had introduced, after he had made him terminate the discussion.

It is surprising to see how old errors linger among men. This of course arises from ignorance and an indisposition to learn. Nothing exemplifies the fact more clearly than the attachment to the Solomonic authorship of Ecclesiastes. Though sound criticism has repudiated it long ago; ignorance still holds it. Even in Germany Von Essen and Wangemann adhere to the antiquated notion. The diction and style effectually prove that the writer does not give a dramatic biography of his own life. Solomon does not reenact the successive scenes of his search for happiness. He does not become the various phases of his former self. If any evidence lie in the work itself, *that* evidence is sufficient to disprove the Solomonic origin.

A more plausible method of vindicating for Solomon some share in the work, is that adopted by Stäudlin, who supposes that the monarch, towards the end of his life, exhausted and satiated with worldly enjoyments, waved somewhat in his principles. Deep melancholy came upon him at times, which pre-

sented all objects in a black form. He felt that all was vain, transitory, and imperfect. As he looked upon the world and saw more evil than good in it, he tormented himself with doubts respecting divine providence. The prosperity of the vicious, as well as the misfortunes of the virtuous, gave him the greatest uneasiness. The Mosaic doctrine of retribution could not give him peace, for he had advanced beyond it; and yet he had not arrived at the stage in which he could satisfactorily solve the riddle of life. Perhaps he had represented this state in several essays, which a later Hebrew found and extracted from, as well as from several proverbs not yet collected, in order to compose the book of Ecclesiastes. This writer introduced king Solomon discoursing of the theme. At the conclusion, he himself added a few remarks indicating the result of the whole, and giving some account of the origin of the book. Thus *the materials* are Solomon's, put into form and shape by a redactor.

The hypothesis in question is wholly improbable. If Solomon composed essays, why were they not given without alteration? At the late period of the supposed editor, the name of the monarch was invested with an excessive sanctity which would have been violated most grievously by putting another garb on anything he had written. The redactor must have totally modernised the language. And how could Solomon himself speak in *it*? Incongruously the whole form of the Solomonic writing must have been removed,—almost the only thing by which the work could have been known and accredited as his. Hence the redactor must have defeated his own purpose. Yet Renan still speaks of a modern redaction altering the primitive style.

Whatever modification of the same view be adopted, it is liable to insuperable objections. If it be alleged that the substance and sentiments were transmitted *orally* and that a late redactor committed them to writing we ask, how could they have been correctly or truly handed down from one generation to another throughout six centuries? What guarantee have we that they were not materially transformed in the mouths of men during that long period? They must have been so in reality, unless a *continued* miracle—which ceases to be one—interposed to prevent it. And then the problem discussed is not one which was likely to agitate the mind of Solomon's age. It required a more advanced time. The Mosaic doctrine sufficed in the flourishing era of the kingdom. It was not till the decline of monarchy in Judah, that such a theme was forced upon Hebrew reflectiveness. The book of Job, which discusses it in a different manner, was much later than Solomon. Besides, internal evidence contradicts the hypothesis in question. Solomon could

not say of his successor, "who knoweth whether he shall be a wise man or a fool" (ii. 19). And he could hardly say "also my wisdom remained with me" (ii. 9); nor would he satirise himself by affirming, "I got me the delights of the sons of men, a wife and wives" (ii. 8). The sentiments often disagree with what we know of Solomon's person and character. The picture of the times is wholly different from his reign. Both ideas and language agree. The former cannot be put centuries prior to the later, without disturbing their natural congruity. Whatever view be taken of the age of Solomon when he uttered such sentiments, it is exceedingly improbable that he *ever* expressed them. He would not have so described himself; especially as the problem is left much as he found it. Unconditional belief in the divine righteousness and power, is not the solution here presented, as in the book of Job. The author cannot get beyond, "Fear God and keep his commandments." But although he does not reach the length of Job's conclusion, it is no small matter that he retains his faith in the fear of God and practical morality. Amid all his objectionable moods and utterances, *that* is not abandoned. *So far*, he does well.

IV. DOUBTS ENTERTAINED OF ITS AUTHORITY AND INSPIRATION.

—It is not remarkable that the book of Ecclesiastes has been a stumbling block to many. The Jews were not unanimous in their opinion of its divine authority, as we learn from the Mishna (Tract. Jadaim 3, 5) where there are notices of disputations on the part of distinguished Jewish scholars respecting the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, and a different opinion of the latter is said to have been entertained by the two schools of Hillel and Schammai. Pesikta Rab. fol. 33, c. 1; Midrash Coheleth fol. 311, c. 1. Vayyikra Rabba, sect. 28, fol. 161, c. 2: "The wise sought to put aside (לִנְזֹל אֶת הַסֵּפֶר ἀποκρύπτειν) the book Coheleth because they found in it words leaning to heresy." Others in the Talmud. Tract. Schabbath fol. 30, c. 2 assign this reason for their wishing to declare it apocryphal, "because its words overthrow one another," a position which Abenezra in his Commentary on vii. 3, illustrates by passages apparently contradictory; to which he applies a harmonising principle of his own. Other reasons were given for the same procedure, such as, "Because all the wisdom of Solomon consists at last in this: Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, etc., which is at variance with Num. xv. 39" (Midrash Cohel. fol. 114, c. 1). Others affirm that the utterances of the book which seem to attribute eternity to the world furnished the great stumbling block; and therefore Maimonides has taken up and copiously discussed the point. Yet they retained the book, as is said in

Tract. Shabbath. fol. 30, 2, "because at the beginning of it and at the end of it are the words of the law" (comp. i. 3 and xii. 3). In the time of Jerome the Hebrews said: "Although among other writings of Solomon which have become antiquated and have not remained in the memory, this book might seem deserving of obliteration because it asserts that the creatures of God are vain and thinks all is vanity, and prefers eating, drinking, and transient pleasures to all things; yet from this one little chapter (the twelfth) it deserved to be numbered with the divine books because it has terminated the whole discussion with the conclusion, 'We should fear God and keep his commandments.'"

A few of the Christian fathers likewise appear to have stumbled at the book. Theodore of Mopsuestia maintained that Solomon had composed both Proverbs and Ecclesiastes for the benefit of others, not from a gift of prophecy he had received, but at least from human prudence; a position for which he was anathematised by the council of Constantinople, since it rejected his divine inspiration when writing the work. We find Philastrius of Brescia also attacking certain anonymous heretics who found fault with the work. Abulfaragius, a Christian writer among the Arabians, thought that Solomon drew the opinion about no resurrection of the dead from Empedocles, a Pythagorean philosopher supposed to be contemporary with David.

Spinoza says of Solomon "that he excelled others in wisdom, but not in the prophetic gift," and he blames him because he taught in Ecclesiastes "that all the goods of fortune are vain to men."

It is needless to quote the sentiments of Le Clerc, or the Halle theologians of a former day.

The New Testament neither cites nor refers to Ecclesiastes. Hengstenberg indeed says the opposite; but his list of 'undeniable' references is taken from the air. What modern critic but himself would gravely bring forward such a catalogue of passages in the New Testament as the following, in connection with Ecclesiastes: Luke xiii. 34 comp. Eccles. i. 1; Luke xii. 16-21 comp. Eccles. ii. 1, 2; Matt. xi. 19 comp. Eccles. ii. 24; John vii. 30 comp. Eccles. iii. 1; John xvi. 21 comp. Eccles. iii. 2; Luke xxiii. 34 comp. Eccles. iv. 17; James i. 19 comp. Eccles. iv. 17, v. 1; Matt. vi. 7, 8 comp. Eccles. v. 1; James iii. 6 comp. Eccles. v. 5, xii. 6; Matt. xxiii. 23 comp. Eccles. vii. 18; John ix. 4 comp. Eccles. ix. 10¹ The fact that the New Testament contains neither any quotation from the book before us, nor any reference to it, furnishes no argument against it.

¹ Einleitung, p. 34.

By a strange interpretation of xii. 11 Hengstenberg makes the author enrol his book among the collection of the Old Testament canonical writings, attribute to it a deeply-penetrating efficacy, and deduce it from divine inspiration.¹ The difficult verse is not properly understood by the learned critic.² Other Old Testament writings stand in the same category. No occasion called for quotation. There is no doubt that Ecclesiastes was in the canonical list from the time that list was completed. Ever since the canon was closed the book was among the Hebrew Scriptures. Hence it has the authority belonging to it as one part of the collection which the apostles regarded as divine. The Saviour himself sanctioned the Jewish writings as a *whole*; though he did not declare *each* and *every part* of those writings to be of divine origin. The attempt to make Christ and his apostles vouch for the inspiration and infallibility of every single book in the Old Testament and every part of each book, is nugatory. All that can be fairly collected from their sayings is, a general sanction of the canonical authority of the collection.

V. VIEWS OF COHELETH RESPECTING IMMORTALITY AND FUTURE JUDGMENT.—Some important questions have been started respecting the belief of Coheleth in a future state, such as his idea of the soul's immortality and of a future judgment. Let us briefly consider these points.

1. What was Coheleth's belief respecting the separate existence of the soul after death? The passages bearing on this point are the following:—

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it" (xii. 7).

"There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest" (ix. 10).

"Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" (iii. 21).

"And this also is a sore evil, that in all points as he came, so shall he go: and what profit hath he that hath laboured for the wind?" (v. 16).

These passages appear to us to imply nothing more than what is found in Mosaism, viz., unacquaintedness with the immortality of the soul. It was an opinion among the Hebrews that the spirit of man is a portion of the divine Spirit which animates and vivifies all things in the world, and that it returned into the same or was absorbed into it. The human spirit was thus an emanation from the divine breath diffused through nature, assuming an individual existence at its union with body, and losing it again at

¹ Einleit. p. 33.

² See Heiligstedt's *Commentarius grammaticus*, etc. pp. 384, 385.

their separation. This belief is contained in the words of Ps. civ. 29, "thou takest away their breath, they die and return to their dust;" of Job xxxiv. 14, 15, "if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath. All flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." It is also implied in Gen. vi. 3, "My spirit shall not always be humiliated in man." In Eccles. iii. 21, the writer professes that he does not know whether the spirit in man and that in beasts return to God in the same manner, seeing they are both alike emanations from Him, or whether the two are distinguished after death, so that the one, because breathed into man in a singular way at first, is not at death lifted up and separated from the spirit of the beasts that goes downward. The proper version of iii. 21 is, "who knoweth the spirit of man, whether it goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast, whether it goeth downward to the earth?" the ה before *עלה* and *יִרְדָּת* being interrogative, *not* the article. Hence it should be pointed with *patach* and *Chateph-patach*, *העלה* and *הִירְדָּת*. The Masoretes punctuated it as the article, because any question respecting the immortality of the soul was a stumbling-block to them. All the ancient versions, the LXX., Vulgate, Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, make the ה interrogative. So do Luther and most recent critics. Hengstenberg, however, abides by the punctuation, adducing various arguments in its favour, which it is needless to refute.¹ While the author is sure that the bodies of both return to dust, he has not arrived at the knowledge of the distinction of their spirits after death. "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts, even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again" (iii. 19, 20). Such are the words preceding the question, "Who knoweth the spirit of man," etc., shewing the darkness of the writer respecting the spirit's future individual existence. The writer does not mean, who *regards* or *considers*, expressing his surprise that so few regarded the different destiny of the spirits of men and brutes, for this is inconsistent with the context. What he means by *spirit*, can be nothing else than the *vital* or *animal* spirit. The same ignorance appears in ix. 10; there is no knowledge in Sheol. There is no wisdom there. It is a region of gloom. It is idle to say with Stuart that Coheleth here recapitulates what the objector had said. No such objector appears directly or indirectly in the preceding context. In ix. 2-6, it is

¹ Commentar, p. 118, et seqq.

plainly predicated that there is no difference between the good and the bad in and after death: "the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward." In xii. 7 the author simply expresses his belief that the spirit returns to God. It is reabsorbed into the divine Spirit, just as the body returns to its original dust, the material whence it was taken. The context of this passage sufficiently shews that Coheleth did not dream of a blessed immortality after death, because the return of the human spirit to God is immediately followed by "vanity of vanities, all is vanity" (ver. 8). Its return to God is apprehended as the invisible continuation of comfortless, joyless old age. This reabsorption of the spirit into God Ginsburg improperly identifies with the heathen doctrine of the soul's refusion into the *anima mundi* or soul of the world, and forthwith declares it heathenish and utterly at variance with the tenor of the Bible. There is a distinction between the things which he confounds. The *anima mundi* was not a direct emanation from one God, the only personal source of life; rather was it identical with Deity and pantheistic. Unlike Coheleth's view, it did not consist with a pure theism. By his style of reasoning Schleiermacher, who at one period of his life at least, believed that the soul of man should be taken hereafter into *allgemeine Geist*, was so far a heathen. The arguments advanced against the view of the passage which regards it as alluding to the re-absorption of the spirit into the Deity are *vague* and *worthless*; such as, that God is described in the Bible as a *personal* and *super-mundane* being separated from and independent of matter; as if such view of the divine nature were not in harmony with the idea contained in the passage: that there is a radical difference between the Creator and the creature,—between their ontological natures,—a fact which, *so far as it is enunciated in the Bible*, is in unison with our exposition, not opposed to it: that the abhorrence of sin and approbation of holiness apparent throughout the Old Testament, shew that the distinction between a soul defiled with one, and imbued with the other, will not be destroyed at once and for ever; as if Coheleth expressly referred here to *souls*, or entertained a definite belief respecting their different futures: that iii. 21 is at variance with our interpretation; whereas that passage expressly denies the separate immortality. It is incorrect to say, that the *spirit going upwards* implies its *separate immortality*. Nor is the sacred writer made to utter *nonsense*, as Ginsburg affirms, by this re-absorption-theory. To remember one's Creator in the days of youth, before old age sets in; to fear God, keep His commandments, and enjoy life rationally, before the body and spirit be separated by death, the latter returning to the God who gave it, is neither absurd nor non-

sensical.¹ In the eye of the Christian it seems a comfortless doctrine; but we should remember that the writer was a Jew living in melancholy times; and that his mind could not fully shake off the distracting doubts with which it was harassed. The problem of the future was to him more insoluble than it had been to many of his enlightened countrymen. The author of Genesis vi. 3 had evidently the same idea respecting the constitution of man; believing that the spirit of God in him was an emanation from Jehovah, which animates the corporeal frame and afterwards leaves it. Thus *רוח* in xii. 7, means *the breath of life*, the living principle, which God gives to animate the body, and takes away at death. As He is the original source of all life, the breath of life He had infused returns to Him. That this is the sense of the word, is proved by iii. 21; Ps. civ. 29; cxxxv. 17; and by its being used synonymously

2. What was the writer's belief respecting a future state of rewards and punishments? The passages that seem to favour an affirmative answer, are these:—

"I said in mine heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked: for he hath appointed a time for everything and for every work" (iii. 17).

"But know thou that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment" (xi. 9).

"For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (xii. 14).

"Neither shall wickedness deliver those that are given to it" (viii. 8).

"It shall be well with them that fear God but it shall not be well with the wicked" (viii. 12, 13).

Other places favour a negative answer, as:—

"For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward" (ix. 5).

"For God giveth to a man that is good in his sight, wisdom, and knowledge, and joy: but to the sinner he giveth travail, to gather and to heap up, that he may give to him that is good before God. This also is vanity and vexation of spirit" (ii. 26).

It will be seen from these places that the author refers to rewards and punishments, and the point to be determined is, did he think of mere *terrestrial* retribution, such as the law of Moses held forth and the prophets predicted; or was it to be after death?

That such passages as iii. 17, etc., refer to retribution in this world, can hardly be doubted. The time is left indefinite; but unless the writer saw much farther than the Jewish authors

¹ See Ginsburg's *Cohleth*, pp. 468, 469.

generally, he meant no more than that God should pass judgment some time or other upon injustice in the present life. Even most of the Apocryphal books, which were later than Coheleth, shew ignorance of the soul's immortality. There is nothing in the context to indicate that the judgment refers to a future state, as Ginsburg alleges; nor is there any antithesis in the succeeding verses. But while the best expositors commonly admit that earthly retribution is intended in the great majority of places, a few hold that in one or two the words cannot be so applied. Thus Oehler refers xi. 9 and xii. 14 to judging *souls*, and consequently to another life; while Knobel maintains, that *the latter* passage has that idea. In xi. 9 we refer the judgment spoken of to the evil days in the following context, *i.e.*, the time of old age. The sins of youth are punished in old age. The judgment begins then in divers ways and forms; for who knows not the fresh vigour which some enjoy at that period, compared with the debility and disease of others. This interpretation harmonises not only with the immediate, but the more remote context; with xii. 7 and ix. 10. A future judgment after death does not suit either the general tenor of the book, or the writer's mental development, which was by no means in advance of the enlightened Jews that preceded him. In regard to xii. 14, it is the only place in the book which has a fair appearance of referring to a future judgment. Knobel gives two reasons for so interpreting it. First, *every work* is brought into judgment. Secondly, the expression, *every secret thing*, is always so employed: compare with Rom. ii. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 1 Tim. v. 24, 25. Here we believe the author had a notion of future judgment, and expressed it. But he has stated it generally. Nothing specific is announced. The time, place, manner of it are not indicated. He had no definite or fixed belief in the fact. Rather was it an inkling or premonition. Whatever shape the feeling assumed, it was obscure; otherwise it must have appeared elsewhere in the book, and exerted a salutary influence in suppressing doubts, as well as sentiments that seem to be contrary. Not long before, he had written that the spirit was to pass into the great source whence it was taken, and lose its personal existence (xii. 7); yet here he affirms that God shall bring every work and secret thing into the judgment, apparently forgetting for the moment what he had said, or rising higher in his idea of the divine retribution and penetrating into futurity. To make him consistent we should put the sentiment into his mouth, that the soul returns to the immediate presence of God, *there to be judged*; but that was not what he definitely thought of. When therefore Stuart asks, "how shall the spirit which has returned to God be judged, if it be absorbed in him

as a part of his subtle, impalpable essence?" he supposes that Coheleth reasoned as *he* does, and had a consistent belief both in the soul's future personality and retribution. This is to attribute to him what the book itself shews to be incorrect. Ps. xvii. 15 is quite misunderstood by the same critic, as though it referred to the resurrection; and Ps. xvi. 11 expresses no more than a transient aspiration or dim presentiment of the soul's existence after death. No evidence can be adduced from the Psalms, nor from any book prior to Ecclesiastes, of the Hebrew *belief* in the soul's personal existence and recompense hereafter. In that respect the present work stands on the same level as its predecessors. "We assume it then," says Stuart, "as a plain doctrine in Coheleth that retribution, adequate and final, does not take place in the present world." The assumption is incorrect. All that the writer attains to is, a vague notion of some final judgment. He *believed* it to be in this life: *the notion that it might be in the next* sometimes flashed across his mind. The latter was nothing but a dim foreboding and hope, not a *settled conviction*. The settled conviction cannot be made out on the sole ground of xii. 14, because so many other passages run counter to it. Through whatever process of investigation his mind may have passed, this can hardly be called a *confirmed opinion*.

If these observations be correct, it cannot be the design of the book, either in whole or in part, to shew that real happiness consists in the belief of a future state of retribution where all mysteries belonging to the present course of the world shall be solved. Such belief did not spring up and grow on Jewish ground. It is the product of Christianity alone. Judaism only groped after it in the twilight.

We are confirmed in the views now expressed by the opinion of Herzfeld, who takes xii. 14, as well as xi. 9, not as referring to the final judgment, but to one upon earth whose punishments are the misfortunes of the entire life, and particularly the sufferings of old age. Not a trace, affirms this learned Rabbi, of belief in a judgment of departed souls appears in the whole book, except the doubts adduced in iii. 18-21.¹

VI. SCOPE OF THE WORK.—The older expositors went far astray in determining the scope of the work, because they proceeded on the opinion that the soul's immortality was taught in it. But Coheleth is only acquainted with the Hebrew Sheol, and the soul's shadowy, impalpable, unpersonal existence hereafter. Hence Desvœux, F. Bauer, J. D. Michaelis, Kleuker, Doederlein, and Zirkel have represented the main idea of the book more or less imperfectly.

¹ Koheleth uebersetzt und erläutert, pp. 178, 189.

For the same reason we must reject the design of the book given by Ginsburg in his excellent commentary. Like many others, he assumes that the writer believes in a future state of retribution where all the mysteries of the present dispensation shall be explained. Had the author really entertained this opinion, he would not have written down a series of difficulties, doubts, objections, counsels, which make up the body of his book, and are not finally or formally done away at the close. Equally incorrect is the hypothesis of others, that the design of Ecclesiastes is an inquiry into the *summum bonum* or chief good. The book itself rejects the idea of the preacher discussing various erroneous opinions, and finally determining the sovereign good to consist in *true wisdom*, whose praise is the scope of the whole. In like manner it is not the object of the preacher, by shewing the emptiness of all things earthly, to force those who follow his argument to deduce the absolute necessity of a future and better existence, as the only solution of the otherwise inscrutable phenomena presented by the course of man's life, as Nordheimer, after Desvoeux, supposes.¹

The true view was approached more or less closely by Schmidt, Paulus, Gaab, Hänlein, Rhode, Bertholdt, Herder, Eichhorn, Umbreit, Knobel, Jahn, De Wette, etc., whose respective opinions need not be enumerated. Knobel and De Wette give the writer's object better than the rest; better in our opinion than even Ewald, Hitzig, or Stuart.

The theme of the book is the vanity of all earthly desires and efforts, as set forth in the first and second verses: "Vanity of vanities; all is vanity. What profit hath a man of all his labour which he taketh under the sun?" This is repeated at the close. "Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; all is vanity" (xii. 8). Hence the purpose of the writer was to point out the emptiness of human life, and to give some directions relative to human conduct suited to such a view of the world. He assumes the position of a man who, having as it were exhausted life, stood on the verge of it taking a retrospect of the way he had come, and lo, there was nothing but the past and the passing. Time had swallowed up all. He had hoped, laboured, searched, inquired, without finding anything; he had indulged in pleasure, and nothing remained of it; now he sees the abyss of nothingness before him, mere emptiness and vanity round about; and within he feels a something he cannot understand, a longing and searching spirit which had failed to find solid peace.

The author enters upon a kind of philosophical discussion. His work is an exhibition of the struggle between the old

¹ Holden, Preliminary dissertations, p. lxxv.

Hebrew view of the world and its affairs, and the higher science of life which some of the best minds in the nation strove to reach. Old Israelitish views had been exposed to new influences, especially to Zoroastrian ideas. The philosophy of the nation was fermenting in various ways and assuming such a shape as rendered it capable of being developed and divided by the Greek philosophy which afterwards affected it so extensively. The elements of Pharisaism and Sadduceeism were in motion, for the views of these tendencies which the Jewish mode of thought soon took under the impulse of Grecian philosophy, appear in Coheleth germinant and scattered. Thus the materials of his thinking were of a mixed kind, though incorporated into the Israelitish philosophy of the day. Judea presented a gloomy aspect at the time. Injustice, oppression, violence prevailed. Tyrannical rulers acted with impunity. Sensual, avaricious, incapable men were promoted to office, while the virtuous and upright suffered. Heathen rulers oppressed the people of God. All this tended to shake belief in the doctrine of divine retribution, and excite doubt. Piety withered in such an atmosphere, and gave way to incipient despair. No wonder therefore that Coheleth strove to find rest for his anxious mind. He saw the wicked prosper, the righteous suffer, even to the end. What became of the Mosaic doctrine of retribution in this world, amid such a state of things? It seemed inadequate to account for it. But with all searching and seeking, he was unable to get beyond the Jewish belief. The writer of the book of Job could hardly do so. Much less might we expect Coheleth, a man of far inferior abilities, to emerge into a clear solution of the problem. Indeed it could not be fully solved on Jewish ground. Christianity alone brings life and immortality to light.

It is pleasing to find that the author does not *abandon himself entirely* to doubts. Some that are uttered are taken back again. Nor does he recommend an *unrestrained* enjoyment of worldly things. He sees and feels that divine providence is immutable; that man has no power over the fixed course of nature. Yet he is not a *rigid fatalist*. Had he been deeply penetrated, however, with an unwavering spirit of holy submission to God's will, and awed by the feeling of His unsearchable greatness, as was the unknown author of Job, he would have presented a higher example of religion. It might have been given him in that case, to get a few glimpses of a future state of immortality, in which the perplexing anomaly of human life and conduct will be cleared up. But his scepticism could not be easily kept down. To subdue it effectually he finds a hard lesson; and therefore he is forced to exclaim at the end, "vanity of vanities, all is vanity." We are pleased in finding that he does not lose

his faith in a divine judgment and final retribution, though he can plant no hope on the grave. His partial experience of the divine government does not extinguish a religious element within him. Hence he recommends the fear of God, moral duty, and uprightness. This is an excellent philosophy viewed from the Jewish standpoint. "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is *the whole man*" (not *this every man should do*), are his closing words. It is true that his creed has not that *positive* element which the book of Job contains, by transferring the solution of the problem to the *department of faith*, a faith resting in the righteousness and power of God with unconditional submission to his will, accompanied with firm trust in the rectitude of what He chooses to conceal from human perception. It has only a *negative* element. But such was the popular creed. Nay, such was the Mosaic doctrine, beyond which the prophets themselves did not advance. Coheleth, with his scepticism, represents the national faith in conflict with the inequalities of the divine administration, but incompetent to a right theodicy.

VII. MODES OF DIVIDING THE CONTENTS.—1. Some think that Coheleth disposed his materials in a dialogistic form, though he neglected to indicate the interchange of speakers. Herder, Eichhorn, Bergst, Paulus, etc., are of this opinion. The conversation is between an inquirer and a teacher, according to Herder and Eichhorn; or, according to Bergst, between a Jewish sophist and an oriental sage of the old stamp, who gets the victory over his opponent. But in partitioning the parts of the supposed speakers, these critics differ considerably from each other.

This hypothesis evidently originated from the desire to introduce a certain plan and unity into a work containing a number of contradictory sentiments. The author, or rather king Solomon whose person he assumes, sometimes speaks of himself in the first person, sometimes to a disciple or hearer in the second. But the book generally bears no impress of a dialogue. The marks of it are shadowy and indistinct. No man could tell, were that the case, where the one speaker ends and the other begins. The lines between are no where apparent. The separations of the speakers' portions, which have been attempted, fail to shew an immediate connection of ideas between the discourses and replies, compelling the reader to assume violent transitions in different directions, and producing a badly formed dialogue. That two speakers are not very obvious is apparent from the fact of Seiler finding three, viz., Solomon, a second sage, and an inexperienced youth who is perpetually suggesting doubts, to the solution of which the conversation of the other two philosophers is directed. The passages in which the alternate speakers com-

mence to deliver their sentiments, are not determined and indicated by the critic. Indeed, they cannot with any probability be gathered from the contents. Had the writer of the book introduced different speakers, it is unlikely he would have left their respective sayings undiscoverable. In the book of Job the speeches are clearly defined.

2. Van der Palm makes two parts, viz., i-vi. and vii.-xii.: Holden i-vi. 9; vi. 10-xii. 14.

3. Koester's division is peculiar, and certainly brings unity into the whole. It is not supported, however, by internal evidence. According to him, i. 2-11 is introductory, followed by four sections, viz., i. 12-iii. 22, concerning the absolute good; iv.-vi., the relative good; vii. 1-ix. 16, respecting true wisdom; ix. 17-xii. 8, of wisdom in its application to particular conditions of life.

4. Vaihinger arranges the contents in four discourses. (a) After proposing the general theme in the second and third verses, that all is vanity, *Cohcleth* shews the vanity of theoretical wisdom applied to the investigation of things, and then of practical wisdom directed to the enjoyment of life, arriving at the result that man by his efforts cannot obtain abiding good (chaps. i., ii.). (b) The second discourse begins with a description of man's absolute dependence on a higher immutable providence, succeeded by an answer to the inquiry after the *summum bonum*, that there is no higher good for man than to enjoy himself; but that such good cannot be easily reached amid the many disappointments observable on earth. Yet under the circumstances a man should strive after happiness through the fear of God, and a conscientious fulfilment of duty, trusting in the providence of the Most High, and setting a proper value on earthly possessions by means of contentment with the share bestowed by God, and cheerful enjoyment of the benefits received (iii. 1-v. 19). (c) In the third discourse the writer sets forth the vanity of striving after riches, develops the true practical wisdom of life, and shews how it is to be gained, notwithstanding all the incongruities of earthly life (vi.-viii. 15). (d) In the fourth discourse these incongruities are particularly examined, maxims being laid down at the same time for the true enjoyment of life; after which, the whole is summed up in the enunciation of the same sentiment that stands at the beginning, viz., that solid unchanging happiness cannot be found in earthly things (viii. 16-xii. 8). Each of these four discourses is subdivided into three sections, thus, i. 2-12, i. 12-ii. 19, ii. 20-26; iii. 1-22, iv. 1-16, iv. 17-v. 19; vi. 1-12, vii. 1-22, vii. 23-viii. 15; viii. 16-ix. 16, ix. 17-x. 20, xi.-xii. 8. This division is artificial and arbitrary. It does not harmonise with many parts of the book, for example, with

the second and third chapters, which are so connected as to be incapable of partition. Both must belong to the same portion. There is no proper division till iv. 16.

5. Hitzig divides the work into three parts, each part consisting of four chapters, viz. i.-iv. 16; v.-viii.; ix.-xii. Our objection to this is, that the concluding part of the eighth chapter is more connected with the commencement of the ninth than with the preceding. No proper break occurs between viii. 16 and ix. 10; though Umbreit agrees with Hitzig in holding the contrary.

It is very difficult to find any general division that does not seem to interrupt the thread of inquiry. We adopt that of Michaelis and Rosenmüller, viz., i.-iv. 16; iv. 17-xii. 8, and the epilogue xii. 9-14.

VIII. UNITY.—Much has been said about the unity of the work. If the writer proposed a theme for discussion, as he undoubtedly did, he must have pursued some plan and method, to give unity to the whole. The kind of unity however is not easily determined with exactness. Some have made it too free, others too close. Mendelssohn errs in the former way; Vaihinger and Ginsburg in the latter. Even Hitzig has introduced too great refinement into the sequence. The method of the writer cannot be close and consecutive throughout. He follows a tolerably free plan. His theme is not unfolded with regularly-increasing clearness till the close. The succession of ideas is not artificially marked. There is a latitude in the writer's treatment of his subject. The course of his ideas must not therefore be cramped by the acuteness or ingenuity of modern critics; for Semitic philosophy is a very different thing from that of the western mind. It does not consist of ratiocination. Second causes are unknown to it. The laws of nature are equally so. Statements are made; doctrines propounded. God is viewed as working immediately in all things. Syllogistic rules and forms never appear. In a word, the science and philosophy of the West are foreign to Oriental idiosyncrasy. In our sense of them, they did not exist in the East. The Semitic nations had a different cast of mind, more devout perhaps, but certainly less scientific. Coheleth's ethical philosophy is not linked together in a chain of consecutive argument. He does not *reason out* his theme in the Japhetic mode. It is easy to apply our ingenuity in finding out logic, method, definiteness of statement and aim, particularity of design, metaphysical connexion of ideas, in the work. But they do not naturally belong to it. Those who construct for him a regular and progressive argumentation, moving onwards with skilful step towards one object, as Vaihinger and Koester do, put western fetters on the free movement of an oriental

mind, which are abhorrent to its nature ; and force the book to give forth a dialectic artificiality which it was never intended to possess.

The author often digresses from his main idea of the vanity of all earthly things. His own objections occasionally interrupt the proper sequence. He repeats the same sentiments—reverts to former propositions, advances the same ideas. The links in his chain are loose. It is the digressions and intercalated utterances that create difficulty to the interpreter, especially as the author, as far as we can judge, does not look like an adept in writing ; nor was his mind preoccupied with a great positive truth waiting to be unfolded. Indeed it sometimes appears as if his discussion were terminated. When therefore he tries to recommence as it were, the difficulty with which he does so produces a degree of awkwardness. He is embarrassed in his search ; and his perplexity of thought occasions obscurity in transitions. Thus the causal connexion of vii. 20 with the preceding is difficult, even after Umbreit's laboured elucidation,¹ which we do not approve of ; the improbable interpretation of Ginsburg ; and the far-fetched expedient of the older interpreters to enclose the nineteenth verse in a parenthesis ; while the verse as a transition to the following is abrupt. Compare also the connection of v. 19-22. That his power of expression was rather limited, may be inferred from iii. 9-18. He had neither the cultivated language of philosophy at his command, nor a general mastery of expression. Care should always be taken not to hold Coheleth responsible for what is not his real opinion ; but to make due allowance for passing thoughts—to separate, as far as possible, what he continued to hold or what he reached at last, from the temporary and objectionable that he got beyond in the course of discussion or was helped by to clearer and better views. We are aware that this is a difficult thing. On the one hand, too great endeavour to make him consistent and consecutive in his reasoning, may betray the expositor into far-fetched and subtle interpretations ; as is the case with Hitzig ; while on the other, want of perception, or a perfunctory style of interpretation, may convert Coheleth into a blunderer who could hardly conduct his argument without obvious mistakes ; as is the case with Knobel. The critic who steers safely between the extremes is likely to be most successful.

IX. SCEPTICAL, EPICUREAN, AND FATALIST TENDENCIES IN THE BOOK.—That a spirit of scepticism often appears in the book cannot be denied. The mind of the writer was seriously dis-

¹ Studien und Kritiken, for 1857, p. 40, et seqq.

turbed by doubts and difficulties. This is apparent from such passages as the following :

"I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts ; even one thing befalleth them : as the one dieth, so dieth the other ; yea, they have all one breath ; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast : for all is vanity. All go unto one place ; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth ?" (iii. 18-21).

"I returned and saw under the sun that the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill ; but time and chance happeneth to them all. For man also knoweth not his time," etc., etc. (ix. 11, 12).

"Therefore I went about to cause my heart to despair of all the labour which I took under the sun. For there is a man whose labour is in wisdom, and in knowledge, and in equity ; yet to a man that hath not laboured therein shall he leave it for his portion. This also is vanity and a great evil" (ii. 20, 21).

"So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun : and behold the tears of such as were oppressed, and they had no comforter ; and on the side of their oppressors there was power ; but they had no comforter. Wherefore I praised the dead which are already dead more than the living which are yet alive. Yea better is he than both they which hath not yet been, who hath not seen the evil work that is done under the sun" (iv. 1-3).

"Yea though he live a thousand years twice told, yet hath he seen no good : do not all go to one place ? All the labour of man is for his mouth, and yet the appetite is not filled. For what hath the wise more than the fool ? What hath the poor that knoweth to walk before the living ?" (vi. 6-8).

"In the day of prosperity be joyful, but in the day of adversity consider : God also hath set the one over against the other, to the end that man should find nothing after him. All things have I seen in the days of my vanity : there is a just man that perisheth in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man that longeth his life in his wickedness. Be not righteous over much ; neither make thyself wise : why shouldest thou destroy thyself ? Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish ; why shouldest thou die before thy time ?" (vii. 14-17).

"There is a vanity which is done upon the earth ; that there

be just men unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked ; again, there be wicked men, to whom it happeneth according to the work of the righteous : I said that this also is vanity" (viii. 14).

In like manner an epicurean tendency appears in a variety of places. We do not mean that there is encouragement to drunkenness, gluttony, and revelling ; nor that the pleasures of sense are to be indulged without regard to the obligations of duty and religion ; but that worldly and sensual enjoyments, such as eating, drinking, living joyfully with the wife of one's youth, are recommended as good things. Thus the following passages say : "There is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy good in his labour. This also I saw, that it was from the hand of God" (ii. 24).

"And also that every man should eat and drink and enjoy the good of all his labour, it is the gift of God" (iii. 13).

"Wherefore I perceive that there is nothing better than that a man should rejoice in his own works ; for that is his portion : for who shall bring him to see what shall be after him ?" (iii. 22).

"Behold that which I have seen : it is good and comely for one to eat and to drink, and to enjoy the good of all his labour that he taketh under the sun all the days of his life, which God giveth him : for it is his portion. Every man also to whom God hath given riches and wealth, and hath given him power to eat thereof, and to take his portion, and to rejoice in his labour ; this is the gift of God" (v. 18-19).

"Then I commended mirth, because a man hath no better thing under the sun than to eat and to drink and to be merry : for that shall abide with him of his labour the days of his life, which God giveth him under the sun" (viii. 15).

"Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart ; for God now accepteth thy works. Let thy garments be always white ; and let thy head lack no ointment. Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity : for that is thy portion in this life, and in thy labour which thou takest under the sun" (ix. 7-9).

Those who endeavour to explain away these expressions, may remind us that they should not be interpreted too literally, nor separated from their connexion. This is freely admitted. Nor is it denied that the enjoyment of life is the main thing inculcated in them, in contrast with excessive earnestness and exertion after future good. Still it is apparent that the enjoyment of life recommended consists in the pleasures of sense, or self-

indulgence. It is incorrect to assert with Noyes¹, that the preacher tells us a man cannot have the enjoyment of life he recommends except by "the gift of God to those who are good in his sight," that is, who discharge the duties of morality and religion (chap. ii. 26); for what God gives to a man that is good in His sight is specified as *wisdom, knowledge, and joy* (ii. 26). The epicureanism of the writer is not gross or excessive, but moderate. Still it has a tinge sufficient to characterise it as epicurism.²

In the same way an inclination to fatalism is observable here and there. Everything is represented as occurring in a fixed, invariable order. All things are foreordained by God, so that man has no power to alter them. Thus: "To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to mourn, and a time to dance; a time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together; a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing; a time to get, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away; a time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak; a time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war, and a time of peace. What profit hath he that worketh in that wherein he laboureth? I have seen the travail which God hath given to the sons of men to be exercised in it. He hath made every thing beautiful in his time: also he hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end" (iii. 1-11).

"I know that, whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it: and God doeth it that men should fear before him" (iii. 14).

"That which hath been is named already, and it is known that it is man: neither may he contend with him that is mightier than he" (vi. 10).

"Consider the work of God: for who can make that straight, which he hath made crooked?" (vii. 13).

"All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth and to him that sacrificeth not: as is the good, so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all: yea, also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and

¹ New translation of the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, p. 85.

² See Knobel, Commentar ueber das Buch Koheleth, Einleitung, § 2 p. 22 et seqq.

madness is in their heart while they live, and after that they go to the dead" (ix. 2, 3).

Having thus seen that the mind of Coheleth had leanings to scepticism, epicureanism, and fatalism, the question arises, how they are to be viewed? There are two relations in which they may be looked at.

First, they may have been temporary states of mind in Coheleth—phases through which he passed—arising out of his processes of inquiry, not ultimate conclusions. They were part of the difficulties and doubts which he uttered as they arose, but afterwards overcame.

Secondly, they may have been introduced as objections which others would express, and therefore should not be put to the writer's own account.

Many critics adopt the former view. They believe that he has given a picture of the struggle through which his mind had passed when he investigated the phenomena of daily life. This is true and correct. He had doubts, difficulties, stages of perplexity, which are expressed in the course of the work. His opinions were fluctuating and unsettled. But the point in debate is, Did he arrive at settled and permanent convictions? Did his mind become peaceful and calm in the end? Did he come to a full and definite conclusion? Here much caution is needed, lest more be deduced from the book than what it was meant to shew. Did he begin with doubt, and end with full conviction of truth? We cannot say so. While freely allowing that he got over some of his doubts and difficulties, we cannot perceive the evidence of a final, deliberate opinion, on which his mind reposed with satisfaction. He did not reach in belief the soul's immortality. Neither did he come to the doctrine of retribution in another life. While it is only reasonable to suppose that the *final* conclusions in a work of professed inquiry should alone be taken as the index of the writer's ultimate opinion, we ask where is that deliberate and final view? That a course of investigation was conducted by the author is plain; though it is neither formal nor consequential; but we desire to ascertain the turning point, at which he emerged into light. The answer of Hitzig repeated by Stuart is, at the beginning of the ninth chapter. Here, say they, we have no more of the desponding utterances, *all this I have seen : all this have I tried* : no more of the cheerless conclusion; *all this is vanity*. Doubts and queries are dismissed. Coheleth stands on new ground. His spirit has been purified. This answer is unsatisfactory. In ix. 10—x. 20 the author resumes his former method, and shews anything but a clear and settled conviction of the truth. On the contrary he relapses into a state of anxiety and doubt, as before. Hitzig

himself admits this, but offers no explanation of it. And does not Coheleth say at the very close of the work, *Vanity of vanities, all is vanity*, immediately after the words, "the spirit shall return to God who gave it?" (xii. 7, 8). Does he not say after ix. 1, "All that cometh (all that come into the world) is vanity?" (xi. 7). Does he not say too of childhood and youth that they are vanity? (xi. 10). If such expressions do not indicate a mind cheerless and unsettled as before in i.-viii., we cannot interpret language aright. It has been asserted, however, that the crowning reward of all Coheleth's inquiries is, that *we should fear God and keep his commandments, because this is the whole man*. Yet the fear of God had been enjoined before (v. 6); for the writer had said, "Surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God" (viii. 12); those that fear Him shall experience deliverance (vii. 18); and, He doeth certain things that men should fear before Him (iii. 14). These passages shew that Coheleth did not come to any settled and permanent conclusion consisting in *the fear of God* other than he had already expressed and followed up with doubts and difficulties. It was no new result at which he had arrived in the end. He had expressly given utterance to it before, and then shifted away from it. It should also be observed, that Coheleth's *fear* of God partakes more of the fear of terror than that of reverence. It looks upon Him as a Being far off, not near at hand to meet human needs. It is the fear of exciting His anger, accompanied by a desire of propitiating His favour. It is not the love and reverence of a Ruler pure and holy who punishes sins and rewards self-sacrificing virtue; but a feeling whose root is in self. This is evident from v. 2-7 where God is spoken of as one in heaven whose patience is not to be trifled with, and from whose debt a man should at once free himself by paying the vow he may have made. Besides, the end of the whole discourse as given in the words "fear God," etc., is not a compressed summary of the book stated in the highest generality it admits of, neither is it the germ of the contents. It is neither the result to which the discussion was tending, nor the conclusion of it reached with difficulty. Several other admonitions of co-ordinate value are presented in xi. 1 and onward. All that the writer means to say in xii. 13 is, that this is *the end, the limit* he puts to his discourse; not *the sum* of it, nor the *final resultant* of his enquiries. The right translation is, "the end of the discourse [this is]; the whole has been heard;" not, "in conclusion, every thing is noticed [by God]" as Ginsburg strangely renders, contrary to **הכל** with the article, and importing an idea into the words which is foreign to them.

It has also been asserted that Coheleth comes to a *full* and

definite conclusion in relation to the doctrine of retribution with which his mind has been distressed, "God will bring to judgment every work with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil" (xii. 14). Surely, however, he had already said, "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked" (iii. 17), and "for all these things God will bring thee into judgment" (xi. 9). It is difficult to conceive that his *belief* in the judgment here referred to was different from that in xii. 14. Future judgment in another world is not meant in iii. 17, xi. 9. Why then should xii. 14 be differently represented? All that can be deduced from the last passage is a faint foreboding of retribution beyond the present—a hopeful anticipation of it, not a settled conviction—else the whole character of his inquiries would have been changed. If he did get out into the clear truth at last, surely he would not have allowed what he had written to stand as it is, with its apparent contradictions and repetitions of the same ideas. We can hardly suppose that he began to write without a definite purpose—some leading idea or ideas he intended to unfold. In other words, he saw beforehand the conclusion at which he meant to arrive in his own way. If this be so, why does he go backwards and forwards in so peculiar a fashion, sometimes progressing and again retrograding in the course of the inquiry? Why does he wrestle with doubts and difficulties, finding no rest till the very close? Surely the conclusion he meant to arrive at would have told most favourably on the method of his discourse in the book, had he set out with it in his mind. And if he began at random, not knowing whither the hard mental struggle would lead, but got at last to a settled conclusion, in which he confidently reposed, is it conceivable that in an age of making books he would have allowed what he had written to remain with all its windings to and fro. A full and definite conclusion must have appeared so important to the author as to revolutionise the preceding treatment of his theme. We know how a critic may try to neutralise this reasoning. He may put it to the account of Coheleth's deficiency in writing. One may suppose that he was not a skilful man of letters, but was so busy with searching, so entangled with a discussion over which he had not the mastery, as to involve himself in repeated contradictions. We cannot see much probability in this view. It is derogatory to Coheleth. The work shews that he was a man of considerable powers. He had a reflecting mind, which alone would have told upon his discussion of the subject, apart from skill in composition or mastery of expression and style. It requires no great practice in literature to prevent repetitions and contradictory statements in the compass of so brief a work.

We have thus seen that the view advocated by Hitzig and Stuart cannot be sustained. It is not correct to say that the passages of the book which bear the marks of scepticism and epicurism should be repudiated as representing transient states of Coheleth's mind or mere stages of discussion, while others towards the close are the index of an ultimate opinion. The latter, as distinct from the former, cannot be made out.

Secondly, it has been supposed that the exceptionable passages were introduced as expressing objections which others would utter. This is probable enough in the case of some ; as in x. 16-19 compared with the twentieth verse. But all cannot be so explained. The hypothesis furnishes too narrow a basis for solving the difficulty. Hence it may be adopted *along with* the preceding explanation. Nothing prevents the association of the one with the other, as various critics do unite them. Coheleth brings before his readers doubts suggested by observation and reflection, or in some cases presented to him by others. How then does this additional circumstance help to solve the question before us ? We cannot see that it contributes so much to the solution as to make it come forth in a shape fit for acceptance. Are all the passages in which sentiments savouring of scepticism, epicurism, and fatalism are found, taken away from the writer's own belief by this expedient ? To deny their existence is hazardous, though Stuart does so in effect. They cannot, however, be ignored by bold assertion. The evidence is too palpable for that. Thus we read in ix. 1, 2, "the righteous and the wise and their works are in the hand of God (depend on the necessary and immutable order of things appointed by God) ; no man knoweth either love or hatred by all that is before them (they do not know hereafter whether they are to love or hate, because all is before them. Whatever men do, and whatever happens to them, are foreordained to them by God, and cannot be altered). All things come alike to all ; there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked, to the good and to the clean, and to the unclean, to him that sacrificeth and to him that sacrificeth not ; as is the good so is the sinner ; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath." (All are subject to the same unknown fate, which, however variously it works in appearance, embraces all alike within its grasp). If such language have not a fatalist import we are unable to understand its meaning. To say with Stuart that there is no more in it than there is in nearly all the reformed creeds of Christendom is nothing to the point. It is *not* the *common* doctrine of those creeds that God has *foreordained all things*. And if it were, it would not be Scriptural doctrine. God does not foreordain *sin*. If Coheleth had said that God foreordained that man should act

freely, all would be right. But so far from this, he affirms, that *none knows whether he is about to love or to hate*, because all is predestinated by God, both what men do and what befalls them. In like manner we might shew that an epicurean tendency cannot be denied, without running counter to the express declarations of Coheleth. It is no refutation of our opinion to adduce the language usually accompanying admonitions to eating, drinking, and such sensuous enjoyments, viz., that they are the *gifts of God*; rather does it confirm it, because every thing in life is looked upon as the divine arrangement. And do we not hear Coheleth say, "Wherefore I perceive that there is *nothing better* than that a man should rejoice in his own works; for that is his portion: for who shall bring him to see what shall be after him?" (iii. 22). Since then the passages cannot be explained away or denied the question recurs, in what light should they be viewed? It is reasonable to think that no writer would knowingly contradict himself, as Coheleth does, and that within limits so narrow as occasionally not to exceed a few verses. It is also reasonable to believe that in a work of disquisition, objections would be adduced and answered. We do not reject either supposition, or both together. The writer should not at once be regarded as contradicting himself, unless he move backwards and forwards in his investigation without any settled opinions. Nor should his own doubts and difficulties, any more than the objections of others, be laid to his account, as if they were deliberate and final convictions. All the passing thoughts he has set down in writing should not at once be assigned to a fixed belief, unless it can be shewn that they were subsequently laid aside as forming no part of it. But with all these allowances, we must hold that the mind of Coheleth never got fairly out of all its doubts. It is impossible, in every instance, to distinguish what he disowned, and what he finally adhered to. Any line separating the two cannot be drawn, for it is impalpable. That some things were rejected immediately after they were announced, we cannot well doubt. That a thing represented as plausible at one stage of the inquiry, is sometimes put in a truer light on a subsequent occasion, we fully believe. But the main point still recurs, what is the writer's *ultimate, established* opinion? Where does it come out? Shew us the testing sentiments by which we may cast out of the writer's passing belief, what he did not truly adopt. To take for this purpose a solitary assertion at the end of the work, is arbitrary. And what is more, no declaration there, even that about *bringing every thing into judgment*, is especially new. As early as iii. 17, the idea of God judging all men was clearly enunciated. It had not, therefore, exercised any material in-

fluence in settling and purifying the writer's mind. Why then should it be regarded in xii. 14 as the decisive test of all his thinking? It is his ultimate proposition—that with which he stops; but there is no real ground for considering it *the solvent* of his doubts, difficulties, and worldly sentiments respecting the course of God's providence and man's duty. The true view seems to be, that the writer emerged into no settled conclusions by which all his scepticism and epicurean notions were effectually dissipated. He succeeded in suppressing them for a time. Whether he was fully satisfied with his ultimate statement is questionable. It was the best thing he could find amid his perplexities; but it reached only a small way towards a *solution* of them. His mind became calmer and better by fixing upon it, without obtaining *solid* or *permanent* satisfaction.

These remarks must not be understood as implying a denial of convictions on the part of Coheleth; or of ideas that clung to him throughout. The divine judgment of man's thoughts and actions was a conviction; not *the* conviction which constituted *the* result that had been wrung out of painful and distressing struggles of mind. It was an idea entertained at the beginning of his perplexities, not the conclusion, in which all the threads of discussion united at last. It was a right and good conviction lodging in his breast, but not one of overwhelming power to silence doubts at once and for ever. Hence it could only have been *one element* in a full solution of the problem. Indeed, it is only on christian ground where life and immortality have been brought to light, that a solution can be found.

Those who think that the writer believed in a future state of retribution, must be perplexed by the method of discussion pursued. Indeed their opinion is inconsistent with it. The doubts and difficulties of Coheleth would have been effectually removed by his belief in another life. In the course of the argument he could not have thrown off thoughts on various topics, which evidently gave him uneasiness, and even weakened his faith in retribution generally, if such had been the national creed. And why should we attribute belief in future retribution to Ecclesiastes, when no other canonical book of the Jews asserts it. Even the writer of Job could not arrive at it. The thing does not appear in the sacred literature of his nation. Nor is this surprising. Christianity has something better than Judaism to offer to the world. In fact, the book must have borne another complexion, if proceeding from one who had faith in the christian doctrine of rewards and punishments. Its recommendations or practical inferences would have been different. Is it likely that the conclusion, "*Wherefore I perceive that there is nothing better than that a man should rejoice in his own works*;

for that is his portion" (iii. 22), or the similar inferences in iii. 12, 13; v. 18-20; vii. 14; viii. 15; ix. 7-10, etc., came from such a man? In view of the vanity and shortness of life, could he not easily have attained to a higher standpoint? Or could he have pursued such a method of solicitude, as he looked abroad on the world and connected it with God's moral government? The problem can only be discussed with anxiety on Jewish ground; and we are unable to see how it could be so discussed by a believer in a state of future recompense, with such recurring scepticism, repressed not silenced; overpowered by faith yet still unremoved.

It may serve to make these observations more apparent if we remark that the sentiments recommended in ii. 24; iii. 12; v. 17; viii. 15, but more theoretically than otherwise, are repeated with the writer's full conviction at ix. 7. Yet the principle so enjoined has an epicurean tinge. It was never retracted. Coheleth evidently held it to the last. How Hengstenberg can assert ix. 7-10 to be the sword of faith with which the writer scatters the doubts expressed in ix. 1-6, we are unable to perceive.¹ The whole passage ix. 1-10 is in full harmony with itself.

THE SONG OF SOLOMON.

I. TITLE.—In the first verse, the Song of Solomon is styled **שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים** *a song of the songs*, i.e. according to the Hebrew usage, *a most excellent song*. The authorship is at the same time assigned to Solomon; the **ל** prefixed to **שְׁלֹמֹה** denoting the writer, as in many inscriptions of psalms. There is no reason for denying, with Weissbach,¹ that **אֲשֶׁר ל** is synonymous with **ל** in the inscriptions of psalms, or with the genitive alone without **ל** in the titles of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. And he errs in explaining it *having relation to*, the particular relation being left indefinite. In like manner it is only a mistake to understand by the title song of songs *a collection of songs*, with Kleuker; or *a chain of songs*, as if **שִׁיר** should be pointed, **שִׁירָה**=**שִׁיר**, with Velthusen and Paulus.

II. CONTENTS.—The story is simple. A rural maiden named the Shulamite, who was harshly treated by her brothers, and had just espoused a young man with whom she had been acquainted from childhood, is carried into the royal tent of Solomon. The voluptuous monarch tries to win her affection by every means in his power; plies her with entreaties and blandishments; loads her with praises; and prefers her to all his women. But she cannot be induced to lend a favourable ear to his desires. Constant in her affection, she rejects the princely overtures, and is perpetually thinking of her beloved, declaring her ardent attachment to him, and earnestly wishing that she may return to him and the place where he is. After Solomon had tried in vain to alienate her affection from the shepherd, she is freed from the harem, and hastens to rejoin her beloved bridegroom in the country.

The poem may be divided into six sections.

1. Chap. i. 2—ii. 7.—After the inscription, the Shulamite

¹ Das hohe Lied Salomo's erklart, u. s. w. pp. 104, 105

appears in the royal tent in the country into which she had been carried, still clothed in her rustic robes, but thinking only of her absent shepherd-lover. The court ladies attendant on the king look curiously at her on account of the swarthy colour of her face; but she informs them that it was caused by exposure to the sun; for her brothers had obliged her to keep their vineyards. Continuing her soliloquy after this, she asks her lover, as if she were already free, where she may find him. The ladies wondering at her foolishness derisively bid her go and feed her sheep (i. 1-8). Solomon now steps forward, praising her beauty and promising to adorn her with a beautiful chain (i. 9-11). But she praises her beloved, and is insensible to the monarch's words. Overcome with grief and desire she then implores the women around her to grant her leisure to think of her friend (i. 12-14, Shulamite; 15, Solomon; 16, 17-ii. 1, Shulamite; ii. 2, Solomon; ii. 3-7, Shulamite).

2. ii. 8-iii. 5.—Here the place is not changed; but the time is supposed to be considerably prior to that in ii. 7. The Shulamite refers to the occasion of her being first separated from her beloved who invited her out into the fields in the spring. The fifteenth verse gives the words of her brothers, which led to the separation; not the isolated fragment of a drinking-song, as Magnus supposes. She consoles herself, however, with the inseparableness of their hearts, bidding him hasten to her side (ii. 8-17).

The espoused one now relates a dream which she had respecting her lover, saying that she had sought but did not find him; that she had risen up and gone through the streets (of Shunem); and when she met with the watchmen of the city and asked them if they had seen her beloved, they had hardly passed her by when she laid hold of him and took him to the house of her mother (iii. 1-5).

3. iii. 6-v. 1. Solomon is now described returning to Jerusalem from his royal castle in the country, with great pomp and splendour. The people admire the magnificent palanquin in which the Shulamite is conveyed (iii. 6-11). Wishing to procure her favour by his flatteries, the monarch praises her gracefulness, and greatly desires to gain the love of one so beautiful (iv. 1-7). In iii. 6-11, spectators looking at the procession from the country, are supposed to speak. Solomon is represented as having all preparations made for his marriage. He is crowned, but she is not. He appears resolved to overcome her inclination.

The language of iv. 1-7 is sufficient to shew that Solomon is the speaker here, not the shepherd-lover. The latter, who is suddenly introduced, assures her that he would attempt every-

thing to rescue her from her perilous position. He then praises her chastity, fidelity, and modesty; employing the figure of an enclosed garden (iv. 8-16).

The Shulamite replies in iv. 16*b*.; and the shepherd responds in v. 1, giving utterance to his delight in her charms. The poet addresses them both:—

Eat, O friends!
Drink, yea drink abundantly, O beloved.

4. (v. 2-vi. 3). The Shulamite relates a dream she saw respecting her shepherd to the court ladies. The purport of this was, that he came to her dwelling at night and asked her to let him in. At first she was reluctant to do so; but when he put his hand through the window, and begged more earnestly that he might be admitted, she rose up and opened the door, but found him gone, and called him in vain. In seeking him, she met with the watchmen of the city, who wounded and shamefully treated her. She then beseeches those ladies that if they found her friend, they would tell him how sick of love she was. When they ask what his attractions are more than those of an ordinary lover (v. 9), the Shulamite describes his personal appearance and beauty. After the description, the daughters of Jerusalem inquire whither he is gone (vi. 1), professing their willingness to go with her to seek him out. She answers that he has gone to his garden; and declares that their affection is mutual and inseparable.

5. (vi. 4-viii. 4). Solomon now appears and addresses the Shulamite in flattering terms, affirming that he prefers her to all his wives and concubines. In vi. 10 he cites the encomium of the court ladies upon her. The Shulamite explains how she had fallen in with the royal cortege; at the sight of which she was at first frightened, and hastened away, till by the advice of the court ladies she remained (vii. 1*a*.), and so came to be seen by the king, who tries to induce her to love him, and therefore celebrates her beauty (vi. 4-vii. 9).

The Shulamite declaring that she is wholly devoted to her bridegroom, and so shewing that she steadfastly resists all the arts of Solomon, speaks to her shepherd as if she were already free, inviting him to go to the country with her and enjoy the pleasures of life there. She wishes that he were a brother to her, that she might manifest her attachment to him in public, introduce him into her mother's house, and give him the most delicious drinks. Then, exhausted with the strength of her affection, she wishes for the presence and embraces of her lover, and beseeches the court ladies not to attempt to turn away her affection from him (vii. 10-viii. 4).

6. (viii. 5-14). The shepherd is supposed to have been at the palace; and Solomon, finding her proof against his allurements, had set her free. In company with the bridegroom she returns to her native place, and visits the apple trees where they had first pledged their vows. Speaking of her virtue and innocence as things invincible to temptation, she reminds her brothers of what they had said about her preserving or losing her chastity before she was marriageable. In alluding to her temptations, she says, that though Solomon was a very rich man, having a most valuable vineyard, yet that she despised all his possessions, content to preserve her innocence. In conclusion, the shepherd with his companions requests of her a song. With this she complies, as she sits in her garden invisible, and repeats the words she had already sung (ii. 17):—

Make haste, my beloved;
And be thou like to a roe, or to a young hart,
Upon the mountains of spices.

The mountains of separation exist no longer: mountains, fragrant with spices, take their place.

III. SPEAKERS.—There is considerable difficulty in determining the speakers throughout, because they are not marked by the poet. Hence the diversity of opinion on the point. The diction and context are the best guides, the former being suited to the character whence it is supposed to proceed. Solomon speaks in a more ornate strain than the Shulamite or her shepherd. This is but natural.

1. There is the Shulamite, whose name appears but once, vii. 1. She was from *Shulem*, a place which has been identified with the modern village of Solam, at the west end of little Hermon. A more usual form of the word is *Shunem*, a city in the tribe of Issachar (Josh. xix 18), on the way from Gilgal to Carmel, not far from Gilboa. Eusebius speaks of a place *Sulem*, five Roman miles south of mount Tabor.¹ On account of the article prefixed, it is better to take the word as a Gentile name, than with the Vulgate *pacifica*, peaceful, which Hengstenberg and others follow. There is no foundation for saying with some, that the names *Solomon* and *Shulamith* are as significant, and related one to another, as John Bunyan's Christian and Christiana. The Shulamite calls her shepherd דודי, רעי, and שֶׁאֶהְיֶה לְךָ. She never addresses Solomon present; once she does so in his absence (viii. 12).

2. The shepherd espoused to the Shulamite. He calls his beloved :

¹ See Meier's *das Hohelied in deutscher Uebersetzung, Erklärung, u. s. w.* p. 143.

3. Solomon who praises the Shulamite. He calls her רָעִיָּה, 'בת־נָרִיב' and 'וְנָתִי תַמְתִּי'.

4. The court ladies or daughters of Jerusalem. When they address the Shulamite they call her הָיָפָה בְּנָשִׁים.

5. Brothers of the Shulamite speak in viii. 8, 9, and probably elsewhere.

6. Others are also introduced speaking, as in iii. 6-11. They are spectators at Jerusalem.

It has been thought by some that Solomon is depicted as a bridegroom in iii. 6-v. 1. In that case he enters into Jerusalem in royal pomp, adorned with a nuptial garland. His marriage with one of the daughters of Jerusalem may be described; as Hitzig and others suppose. We believe, however, that Solomon is set forth in the passage riding in royal state, in a gorgeous palanquin, along with the Shulamite, and having on his head the same nuptial crown he wore on the occasion of his marriage with Pharaoh's daughter. Thus he approaches Jerusalem, surrounded by his guards, and dressed in royal fashion, for the purpose of winning and espousing the country maiden. The king is not depicted as a bridegroom, but he who styles the Shulamite כַּלָּה, spouse, *i.e.* the devoted shepherd. Hitzig also lays some stress on the phrase בַּת־נָרִיב, *daughter of a prince*, which he thinks inapplicable to the Shulamite, and applies in consequence to a concubine of princely descent. This is an unnecessary inference. The phrase means *noble daughter* in reference to her noble disposition, not her high position. This is the only sense suited to the context, as Hengstenberg justly remarks.¹

IV. CHARACTER OF THE SPEECHES.—The genius and character of Solomon's addresses are very different from those put into the mouth of the shepherd. Those of the monarch are full of alluring words devoid of sincerity and true tenderness. There is an artificiality about them, shewing that they do not proceed from the heart. Occasionally they border upon the indecorous and improper. His figures are often far-fetched. This is exemplified in vii. 1-5:

How beautiful are thy feet in sandals,
O princely daughter!
The circuits of thy hips are like a neck ornament,
The work of a skilful artificer.
Thy navel is a round goblet,
Let not spiced wine be wanting in it.
Thy belly is an heap of wheat,
Set about with lilies.

¹ Das Hohelied Salomonis, p. 184.

Thy breasts are like the young roes,
 Twins of a gazelle.
 Thy neck is as a tower of ivory;
 Thine eyes are as the fish pools in Heshbon,
 By the gate of Bath-rabbim.
 Thy nose is as the tower of Lebanon,
 Which looketh towards Damascus.
 Thine head upon thee is like Carmel,
 And the hair of thine head like purple.
 The king is captivated by the locks.

On the other hand, the addresses of the shepherd bear the marks of ingenuous and rustic simplicity. They breathe the feelings of a pure mind, faithful in its love and innocent in its purposes. For example, iv. 8-16:

With me from Lebanon, my betrothed,
 With me thou shalt come from Lebanon;
 Thou shalt look from the heights of Amara,
 From the top of Shenir and Hermon;
 From the lions' dens,
 From the mountains of leopards.
 Thou hast put heart into me,
 My sister, my espoused;
 Thou hast put heart into me,
 With one of thine eyes,
 With one chain of thy neck.
 How fair is thy love, my sister, my spouse,
 How sweet is thy love above wine!
 And the smell of thine ointments above all spices.
 Thy lips, O my betrothed, drop honey;
 Honey and milk are under thy tongue,
 And the smell of thy garments is like the smell of Lebanon.
 An enclosed garden art thou, my sister, my betrothed,
 An enclosed garden, a sealed fountain.
 Thy plants are a paradise of pomegranates,
 With pleasant fruits,
 Cypresses and nards,
 Nards and crocus,
 Calamus and cinnamon;
 With all trees of frankincense,
 Myrrh and aloes;
 With all the chief spices.
 A garden spring,
 A well of living waters,
 And streams from Lebanon.

V. MODES OF INTERPRETATION.—Few books in the Bible have given rise to such a variety of interpretation as the Canticles. We may reduce the different modes of explanation to three.

1. The allegorical or mystical. The supporters of this method differ in sentiment thus:

(a) Some say that Christ is the principal subject. He is the lover or Bridegroom. The beloved or bride is the entire Christian church in the view of some; each individual Christian soul in that of others. Many, however, combine these modifications.

(b) Kindred to the last opinion is that which regards the song as a prophetic delineation of the fortunes of the Christian church. This is a sort of prophetic-allegorical method of explanation, adopted by Cyprian.

(c) Others say that the relation of Jehovah to the Jewish people is the subject; either the love of Jehovah towards the church of Israel, or a figurative picture of Israel's history from the exodus till the final redemption.

These two opinions touch one another according to those who suppose that the Jehovah, whose love to his ancient people is described, is none other than Christ who has revealed the glory of God to mankind in all times, and offered himself a sacrifice for their sins. The church of the Old Testament and that of the New stand therefore in the same general relation to Christ.

2. A class of interpreters explain the poem *typically*. They abide by the literal interpretation, but assign to it a spiritual sense. This presupposes a historical occurrence or actual fact to have happened; which the poet employs in a typical way, to set forth an idea or recommend a spiritual relation. Those who advocate the typical sense generally assume that Solomon's marriage with Pharaoh's daughter, or with some other, is the historical basis employed to depict the love of God or of Christ to the church. Among the advocates of this view may be mentioned Lowth, Hofmann, Delitzsch, and Naegelsbach. But it is very improbable that a real event is described in the poem; and Solomon's marriage is certainly not the subject. The leading idea of the poem is not marriage. The matrimonial relation is kept in the back ground; whereas it should be prominent, according to this view. Weissbach has shewn that the love-relation of Solomon set forth in the poem is no actual thing but rather an ideal picture.¹

It is obvious that there is no distinct line of demarcation between the typical and allegorical mode of interpretation. The boundaries of the two are indefinite.

3. Another class of interpreters suppose the book to contain throughout a description of earthly love. Here again there is a variety of modifications. Wedded love is represented say some, and so the book is a defence of monogamy; chaste, antenuptial love, say others.

We shall first refer to that form of the allegorical interpretation which has been current in the Christian church since the time of Origen, viz., that Christ is the principal subject.

It is an insuperable objection to such an hypothesis that it tears away the poem from all historical connexions. It has then

¹ Das Hohe Lied Salomo's erklärt u. s. w. § 9, p. 66 et seqq.

no special reference to the Old Testament times. Describing prophetically the love between Christ and his church under the New Testament dispensation, the Jewish character of the book is ignored, and it becomes to all intents a Christian production. The view in question strips it of all real association with the Old dispensation; a proceeding so unusual and arbitrary as to ensure its rejection. No work of the Old Testament is so completely projected into the Christian dispensation as to lose connexion with the times and circumstances in which it originated. Besides, the ideas of Christ both in and immediately after the Solomonic age were entirely different from what are said to be presented here. The Jews had no conception of a personal Messiah so early. Their notions were vague and indefinite respecting a future age of prosperity to the nation. They were perhaps connected loosely with some future king of David's family. They had not then been concentrated on *a person*, the Messiah. Hence Solomon could not personify the Messiah. The development of the Messianic idea was far from being in a state to allow of that. The most exalted Jew could not have had any conception of the New Testament Messiah loving and living for his people.

We must therefore dismiss *this* phase of the allegorical interpretation as inadmissible. Solomon does not represent the Messiah loving his bride, the church.

The most plausible form of the mystical exposition is that which assumes the relation of Jehovah to the Jewish people. This relation is exhibited in figurative language borrowed from that of a bridegroom to his bride, of a husband to his wife.

The following arguments may be stated against the explanation in question :

1. The work contains no intimation of such sense. It should not therefore be adopted. As the warrant is wanting, the thing ought not to be assumed. In all similar cases there is something to suggest the allegorical, and so prevent the expositor from resting in the literal alone. But here a hidden meaning is neither expressly stated nor obscurely hinted. The absence of such key fully justifies the rejection of a mystical sense. It has been said indeed, that a divine key to the allegory is found in i. 4: "the upright love thee;" but the word translated *upright* is taken adverbially, meaning *justly* or *deservedly*; and the subject to the verb is *the virgins*, as in the third verse.

It is hardly necessary to *prove* that there is always an intimation of the allegorical sense where it is intended. It has been affirmed that the eightieth psalm contains no such key. But surely *the heathen* in the eighth verse, and the expressions *man*

of thy right hand and son of man in the seventeenth, shew what *the vine brought out of Egypt* signifies. Israel, is *the man of Jehovah's right hand*, and *the son of man*, rescued from the grasp of the heathen.

2. There is no adequate ground for an allegorical interpretation of the poem in any other part of Scripture, whether Messiah or Jehovah be considered the subject. It is frequently argued that the forty-fifth psalm authorises us to interpret it spiritually, because the psalm in question is supposed to describe the mutual love of Messiah and his people. But there is no reason for thinking that the forty-fifth psalm refers to Messiah. A single verse of it has been accommodated to Christ by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. That is all. The king depicted is not Messiah, and his love to the church; but some Jewish king on the occasion of his marriage. No good interpreter now applies the ode to Messiah. Hence the assumed analogy to the poem before us utterly fails. The same may be said of the seventy-second psalm, which has no relation to Christ, as we have shewn elsewhere.

3. Again, the relation of Jehovah to Israel under the figure of marriage does not appear in the Pentateuch. Israel is not there a virgin beloved of God. Such personification first occurs in Amos v. 2. In Isaiah we meet with the figure of Jehovah's love for Israel like that of a bridegroom to his bride, but not earlier (lxi. 10). It may be admitted that a feeble germ of the figurative relation is contained in the Pentateuch where idolatry and apostasy from God generally are termed *whoredom*; but it is wholly undeveloped even there. And if that be so, the Song cannot exhibit the figure in such a form. When it is recollected that the Pentateuch was not of earlier origin than the poem before us, this argument becomes weighty. It is undeniable that the relation between Jehovah and Israel does not appear in any book prior to this. Is it conceivable then that it would be presented at first in a fully developed form? Would it have been drawn out into minuteness at the very commencement of its use? If so, it were contrary to analogy. There is always due preparation for such a thing.

4. Jehovah's relation to the Jewish nation is described under the figure of a marriage. But here the subject is different. The poem does not describe the marriage relation. It portrays the purity and fidelity of a virtuous, newly-married maiden. True love, pure, innocent, and faithful, exposed to the most dazzling temptations yet resisting them all, is the theme. Hence those who build an allegorical explanation on the ground of descriptions setting forth the covenant relation of Jehovah to his people under the figure of marriage, rest on a false founda-

tion. The word *נָשָׂא* rendered *spouse* in our version, is properly so translated. It has but two senses, viz., *bride* and *daughter-in-law*. Mr. Ginsburg is mistaken in supposing that it only means *betrothed*, i.e., a female under an engagement to marry.¹ It denotes a *newly-married* woman, as the Shulamite was. The shepherd was not only the lover, but the *married* lover of his shepherdess. Solomon does not use the word, but the shepherd-bridegroom, who is the only proper person to employ it.

5. Various parts of the poem are equally unbecoming and irreverent on the hypothesis of their being spoken by Jehovah to Israel.

Behold, thou art fair, my love ;
 Behold, thou art fair ;
 Thou hast doves' eyes within thy locks ;
 Thy hair is as a flock of goats
 That appear from mount Gilcad.
 Thy teeth are like a shorn flock of sheep
 Which came up from the washing.
 All are paired,
 And none among them is bereaved.
 Like a braid of scarlet are thy lips,
 And thy mouth-work is lovely.
 Thy cheeks behind thy veil
 Are like a piece of a pomegranate.
 Thy neck is like David's tower,
 Built for the bulwark of entrances ;
 A thousand shields hang upon it,
 All shields of heroes.
 Thy two breasts are like two young fawns,
 Twins of a gazelle feeding among lilies (iv. 1-5).

And

How beautiful are thy feet in sandals,
 O princely daughter !
 The circuits of thy hips, etc. (vii. 1-9).

In like manner the following language in the mouth of the church is unsuitable and indecorous as applied to Jehovah.

His head is as the most fine gold ;
 His locks are bushy and black as a raven.
 His eyes are as the eyes of doves by the rivers of waters,
 Washed with milk and fitly set.
 His cheeks are as a bed of spices, as sweet flowers ;
 His lips like lilies, dropping sweet-smelling myrrh.
 His hands are as gold rings set with the beryl ;
 His belly is as bright ivory overlaid with sapphires ;
 His legs are as pillars of marble, set upon sockets of fine gold.
 His countenance is as Lebanon, excellent as the cedars.
 His mouth is most sweet, yea he is altogether lovely.—(v. 11-16).

All words of this nature coming from Jehovah to Israel, or from the latter to the former, are out of place, extravagant, and

¹ The Song of Songs translated from the original Hebrew with a commentary, etc. p. 168.

absurd. The length to which some interpreters will go in denying the natural is most manifest from Stowe's clumsy attempt to shew that the passage just quoted has reference to the dress, not the skin! Thus when we read "his head is as the most fine gold," the gold-coloured turban is intended; and when it is said, "his belly is as bright ivory overlaid with sapphires," the snow-white robe and girdle set full of jewels are specified. The critic does not inform us what particular part of the dress is described by "the legs like pillars of marble, set upon sockets of fine gold."¹ Consistently with the same absurd principle, the description of the body in the seventh chapter seems to be regarded by others. Is it possible that the navel, thighs, and belly can be disposed of with the remark that *the dress* of these parts is referred to?

The navel is like a round goblet which wanteth not liquor;
Thy belly is like an heap of wheat, set about with lilies.

Is it thus the divine Bridegroom addresses his spouse the church? Does he praise redeemed sinners, saying to them, "Behold, thou art fair, my love, behold, thou art fair, thou hast doves' eyes within thy locks." "Thou hast ravished my heart, my sister, my spouse: thou hast ravished my heart with one of thy eyes, with one chain of thy neck. How fair is thy love, my sister, my spouse! how much better is thy love than wine; and the smell of thine ointments than all spices?" Does he say to the church, "Open to me, my sister, my love, my dove, my undefiled: for my head is filled with dew, and my locks with the drops of the night?" the interpretation of which let us hear from one of the allegorisers, Matthew Henry: "He pleads distress and begs to be admitted *sub forma pauperis*—under the character of a poor traveller that wants a lodging; '*My head is wet with the dew*, with the cold drops of the night; consider what hardships I have undergone to merit thee, which surely may merit from thee so small a kindness as this.' When Christ was crowned with thorns, which, no doubt, fetched blood from his blessed head, then was his head *wet with the dew*; 'consider what a grief it is to me to be thus unkindly used, as much as it would be to a tender husband to be kept out of doors by his wife in a rainy stormy night.'"

Again, is not this a strange way of the church's expressing her passionate desire of a stricter union with God? "Oh that thou wert as my brother that sucked the breasts of my mother; when I should find thee out, I would kiss thee, yea, I should not be despised."

¹ See the American Biblical Repository for April, 1847.

"The church," says Poole, "here expresseth her passionate desire of a stricter union with and closer communion with Christ than she had attained. And in particular, these may be the breathings of the ancient Jewish church after Christ's incarnation, whereby he was to be their brother (Rom. viii. 29 ; Heb. ii. 11, 12) and a sucking infant."

"My beloved put in his hand by the hole of the door;" very peculiar words to be applied by the church to Jehovah or Christ; yet they are so, meaning according to M. Henry: "When Christ has wrought powerfully upon a soul, he leaves a blessed sweetness in it, which is delightful to it; with this he oiled the lock to make it go easy."

6. The imagery of love is here drawn out into minute details of personal parts and properties repugnant to a devout Jewish mind, and more to a western one, if the Supreme Being and his love to Israel be the theme. The individualising of the book in relation to the affections and emotions of Jehovah, exceeds anything found in the Old Testament. Had the poem dealt more in generals, the claim to an allegorical sense would have been more probable, because in greater proximity to like images elsewhere; but taste, propriety, and scripture analogy are violated by the tedious circumstantiality with which the one idea is unfolded, viz., that God loves his church and is loved by it. To do this, it is surely unnecessary to give a particular description of the bodily limbs and features. God is a Spirit. There is anthropomorphism in the Scriptures. Passions, in which even human frailty and imperfection appear, are ascribed to the Supreme. But here the imagery exceeds in grossness anything that is written elsewhere. So sensuous is it at times, as even to border on the indelicate (viii. 1-3). The words put into the mouth of Jehovah grate harshly on the ear and heart of the spiritually-minded. Surely the figures would have an injurious effect on the oriental mind, if it was thought that they describe the communion existing between God and the church. The warm imagination and sensuous emotions of the easterns could hardly be benefited by the book, did it depict the love of God as pure love between the sexes. This seems to have been felt by the Jews when they forbade its perusal by persons under thirty years of age. Even with our cold western temperament, it is difficult for Christians generally to read it with profit. Hence M. Henry says, that when we apply ourselves to the study of it we must even forget we have bodies. A hard thing to do, as long as we are in the body. The book is commonly neglected. It is neither preached from in the pulpit, nor read in the family for devotional purposes. Curiosity usually leads to its private perusal. It is generally avoided. Stuart asserts that it is "the

better and safer course to place the Canticles, as the Jews did, among the ספרים קדושים or books withdrawn from ordinary use, and betake ourselves rather to the Psalms, and the Proverbs, and the prophets, and the New Testament."¹ Why so, if it expresses, as he says it does, "the warm and earnest desire of the soul after God?" The Jews, on the contrary, apprehended some danger from it to the youthful mind. Why should a book have been given by God to the people of Israel for their spiritual good, if it could not be read *generally* without such a restriction? As far as many were concerned, it might as well not have been written, because they died before the age of thirty. The poem is more liable to do harm to an oriental than to an occidental mind; and therefore we infer that it was not meant to have a mystical meaning.

7. The work makes no mention of Jehovah, His dominion, laws, sanctuary, or worship. It includes no lessons of faith, obedience, and piety towards god, or duty towards man.

8. The total silence of our Lord and his apostles respecting it seems to authorise the idea that it was little regarded by the Jews of Palestine, and that the great Teacher, as well as his disciples, had no desire to rescue it from obscurity.

Notwithstanding this obvious fact, Hengstenberg asserts that the highest of all authorities, that of our Lord and his apostles, speaks in favour of the allegorical interpretation. He quotes these places: Matt. vi. 28-30; comp. Song ii. 1. Matt. xiii. 25; xxiv. 42; comp. v. 2. Matt. xxi. 33, etc.; comp. viii. 11. Luke xii. 35-37; comp. v. 3. Luke xiii. 31, 32; comp. ii. 15. John vi. 44; comp. i. 4. John vii. 33, 34; comp. v. 6. John xxi. 16; comp. i. 8. So this critic supposes that when Christ called Herod *a fox*, he referred to the passage in the Song where we read, "Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines!" He also bids the reader compare Matt. xxvi. 6-13, Mark xiv. 3, John xii. 3, Luke vii. 38, with Song i. 12; John ii. 1-11, with Song ii. 4; John iii. 29, with Song ii. 8; and Ephes. v. 27, with Song iv. 7.²

9. There are some traces in the Mishnah of doubts having been entertained among the Jews regarding the canonicity of the book, notwithstanding R. Akiba's assertion that no Israelite ever disputed it.³ R. Jose saith, Ecclesiastes "does not make the hands unclean, but the Canticles are subject to a dispute." The treatise *Pirke Aboth* refers to similar doubts.

10. Both Origen and Jerome affirm that the Jews forbade any one to read the book till he was thirty years of age, a restriction

¹ On the Canon of the Old Testament, p. 355 ed. Davidson.

² Das Hohelied Salomonis ausgelegt, pp. 253, 254.

³ Mishna Yadaim, iii. 5.

approved by those fathers. This prohibition extended to the beginning and end of Ezekiel, and the first part of Genesis, but for a different reason, *the difficulty of understanding them*; while in the case of the Canticles, *moral danger* led to the restriction. If a spiritual meaning was attached to the book, the reason of the prohibition is not very evident. The very fact of a mystical sense being the only and true one, so far from being a drawback to the perusal of the poem, would be an encouragement to it. To excite the warm and earnest desire of the soul after God is an object which the mystical sense would directly favour; whereas the mere amatory character would be liable to abuse. The restriction is in harmony with the latter, rather than the former.

The arguments of the allegorisers and type-finders do not appear sufficient to invalidate the force of those now given. They are principally the following :

1. The oldest interpretation seems to have been the allegorical one. The Jews who received the book into the canon attached a spiritual meaning to it, else they would not have dignified it with such a position. It owes its place to its supposed mystical import.

This seems probable enough, for it agrees with what R. Azaria (in Meor Enayim) says. It is also favoured by the fact, that the first and most important place is given to the song among the five Megilloth; though the Lamentations of Jeremiah the prophet belong to the division in question. The Chaldee and Syriac interpreters seem to have followed the view of the men who received the book into the sacred collection. But though the Jewish compilers of the holy books, and the old translators regarded the Song as allegorical, we need not follow their sentiments. They were not infallible. Surely we are as able to judge of the interpretation of the work as they were. Hahn supposes that we are not;¹ and assumes a certain principle by which the compilers of the Canon were guided, viz., the immediate connection of a book with the development of God's kingdom under the Old Testament. But *conjecture* is not argument. Whether the collectors of the canonical books had any fixed principles for judging their canonicity is uncertain. We believe that the person or persons who first placed the Song in the canon, took it for the production of king Solomon, agreeably to the title. And the national Hebrew opinion was, that he was an inspired man. Faith in the inspiration of the writer had more to do with the reception of his work into the Canon, than its religious contents; though *they* were not overlooked. Nor can we refrain from comparing the Song with the book of Esther

¹ Das hohe Lied von Salomo, pp. 7, 8.

or Ecclesiastes in its relation to the development of the Divine kingdom—a kingdom which consists *essentially* in righteousness and purity—and putting its tendency in that respect as high as theirs.

The Septuagint translator of Canticles understood it in an allegorical sense. So Keil after Magnus asserts, adducing as proof vi. 8, where the rendering is ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς πλοῦτος, instead of the Hebrew *from the top of Amana*. It is not uncommon for the Greek translators to mistake proper names for appellatives. There is no good reason for saying that the version in question took the Song in an allegorical sense; though Magnus adduces the fact of Egypt being the seat of allegory, and the spirit of the time, as favourable to such a mode of explanation.¹ Evidence of the mystical sense would have been *more apparent*, had the Greek translators followed it.

Jesus Sirach has also been supposed by Keil to furnish proof of his allegorical interpretation of the Song, in xlvii. 17, where we read of Solomon, "Countries marvelled at thee for thy songs, and proverbs, and parables, and interpretations." Here it is said that all the writings of Solomon are mentioned; and therefore the allegorical interpretation of the Song is implied. It is evident, however, that the words do not refer to the writings of Solomon in the Canon, because ἐρμηνεῖαι, *interpretations* of enigmas are not given there. The allusion is to the historical narrative in Kings, as Hengstenberg has remarked.² So too the fifteenth verse alludes to 1 Kings x. 24.

The Wisdom of Solomon also implies the mystical sense of Canticles. So Rosenmüller and Delitzsch assert, relying upon viii. 2, where Solomon addresses wisdom: "I loved her, and sought her out from my youth, I desired to make her my spouse, and I was a lover of her beauty." The resemblance is merely accidental between the two brides.

Josephus³ understood the Canticles in an allegorical sense. So Hengstenberg asserts, because Josephus arranges the Old Testament books so as to put the Song among the prophets. But it is by no means certain that he put it there. More probably did he arrange it with the three containing hymns to God and principles of life for men, viz., Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes.

In the Talmud we find proof that the Jews in the early centuries of the Christian era took it in a mystical sense. Thus R. Akiba says, "The whole history of the world does not offer an epoch equal to the day on which Canticles were given to Israel, for all the Hagiographa are holy, but the Canticles are

¹ Kritische Bearbeitung und Erklärung des hohen Liedes Salomo's. p. 25.

² Das Hohelied, u. s. w., p. 254.

³ Contra Apion. i. 8.

most holy.”¹ In accordance with this authority, various passages are quoted and explained in the Talmud allegorically.

The Targum or Chaldee paraphrase regards the poem as a figurative description of God’s gracious conduct towards the Jews in delivering them from Egyptian bondage, and conferring singular favours upon them till the coming of the Messiah.

Among Christians, Origen was probably the first who explained the Song allegorically. He terms the poem an epithalamium or nuptial song, and assumes a spiritual sense, according to which the union of a soul, or of the church with the Word of God, the divine bridegroom, is set forth. Jerome says that Origen wrote ten volumes of commentaries on the poem, containing twenty thousand verses; and observes, in an epistle to Pammachius and Oceanus, that whereas in his other works Origen had excelled all others, in that on Canticles he surpassed himself. Athanasius, Gregory Nyssene, Jerome, Augustine, and most of the fathers took the same view. It has always prevailed among Christians. Whatever weight be attached to the argument in favour of the mystical sense borrowed from antiquity, we must be guided by other considerations in coming to a safe conclusion.

2. On the supposition of its being an ordinary love song all propriety is violated. The poem abounds with praises of the lover’s person from the lips of the beloved one, and with dispraises of herself. It invites other females to love him, speaks of him as *her brother* and of her as *his sister*. She says of herself, “I am black, but comely.” In short, the longer part of the Song is occupied with the praises of the bridegroom, to whom his bride is a mere foil.

These remarks are of little weight, because they proceed on a total misapprehension of the true meaning, as well as of the lover’s relation to the beloved maiden. The situation in which the female is placed justifies her praises of the faithful shepherd she had espoused. On the other hand, the encomiums heaped upon her are natural in the mouths of the persons from whom they proceed. If it be recollected that the language is poetical, no monstrous violation of propriety will appear. The work is an Oriental poem; and the diction should therefore not be taken as prose. It is the offspring of a luxuriant imagination tinged with the voluptuousness characteristic of the eastern mind. There love is warm and passionate, even while pure. It deals in colours and images which seem extravagant to the colder ideas of the west. Hence it is unreasonable to argue against the application of the Song to human love on the tacit ground of its being western prose. The descriptions of poetry

¹ Yadaim, iii. 5.

always imply flights of fancy; those of eastern poetry particularly so.

3. From a remote antiquity it has been usual among oriental nations to teach religious doctrines, and inculcate devotional sentiments, under the disguise of amatory and drinking songs. This is the case with the songs of Hafiz, a Persian poet of the fourteenth century. The love-poems Nisamis, Leila and Mejnun, Jussuf and Suleicha, have been explained allegorically by the commentators. This habit of expressing the intercourse of the soul with God in productions of apparently an amatory nature, which prevailed extensively among the Persians, Turks, Arabians, and Hindoos, has been copiously explained by Lane, who was present at some of the religious exercises of the Mohammedan dervishes in Cairo. "The darweesh," says Lane, "pointed out the following poem as one of those most common at zikrs, and as one which was sung at the zikr, which I have begun to describe. I translate it, verse for verse; and imitate the measure and system of the original, with this difference only, that the first, third, and fifth lines of each stanza rhyme with each other in the original, but not in my translation:—

"With love my heart is troubled;
And mine eye-lid hindreth sleep:
My vitals are dissever'd;
While with streaming tears I weep.
My union seems far distant.
Will my love e'er meet mine eye?
Alas! Did not estrangement
Draw my tears, I would not sigh.

"By dreary nights I'm wasted:
Absence makes my hope expire:
My tears like pearls are dropping;
And my heart is wrapt in fire.
Whose is like my condition?
Scarcely know I remedy.
Alas! Did not estrangement
Draw my tears, I would not sigh.

"O turtle-dove! acquaint me
Wherefore thus dost thou lament?
Art thou so stung by absence?
Of thy wings depriv'd and pent?
He saith, "Our griefs are equal:
Worn away with love, I lie.
Alas! Did not estrangement
Draw my tears, I would not sigh.

"O First, and sole eternal,
Show thy favour yet to me:
Thy slave, Ahmad El-Bekree,
Hath no Lord, excepting thee.
By Tá-há the Great Prophet!
Do thou not his wish deny.
Alas! Did not estrangement
Draw my tears, I would not sigh."

"I must translate a few more lines, to show more strongly the similarity of these songs to that of Solomon; and lest it should be thought that I have varied the expressions, I shall not attempt to render them into verse. In the same collection of poems sung at zikrs is one which begins with these lines:—

"O gazelle, from among the gazelles of El-Yemen!
I am thy slave without cost:
O thou small of age, and fresh of skin!
O thou who art scarce past the time of drinking milk!"

"In the first of these verses we have a comparison exactly agreeing with that in the concluding verse of Solomon's Song; for the word, which in our Bible is translated a "roe," is used in Arabic as synonymous with "ghazal" (or a gazelle); and the mountains of El-Yemen are "the mountains of spices." This poem ends with the following lines:—

"The phantom of thy form visited me in my slumber:
I said, 'O phantom of slumber! who sent thee?'
He said, 'He sent me whom thou knowest;
He whose love occupies thee.'
The beloved of my heart visited me in the darkness of night:
I stood, to shew him honour, until he sat down.
I said, 'O thou my petition, and all my desire!
Hast thou come at midnight, and not feared the watchmen?'
He said to me, 'I feared; but, however, love
Had taken from me my soul and my breath.'"

"Compare the above with the second and five following verses of the fifth chapter of Solomon's Song. Finding that songs of this description are extremely numerous; and almost the only poems sung at zikrs; that they are composed for this purpose, and intended only to have a spiritual sense, (though certainly not understood in such a sense by the generality of the vulgar); I cannot entertain any doubt as to the design of Solomon's Song. The specimens which I have just given of the religious love-songs of the Muslims have not been selected in preference to others as most agreeing with that of Solomon, but as being in frequent use; and the former of the two as having been sung at the zikr which I have begun to describe."¹

That the poets of Hindostan indulged in similar compositions is shewn by a reference to the *Gîta-govinda*, the production of a famous Hindoo writer named Jayadeva. This is a mystical poem intended to celebrate the loves of Crishna and Râdhâ, or the reciprocal attraction between the divine goodness and the human soul. It may be found in the third volume of the *Asiatic Researches*; or at the end of Dr. A. Clarke's *Commentary on the Canticles*.

¹ Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, vol. ii. p. 215 et seqq.

Plausible as these analogies seem, they do not support the conclusion for which they are adduced. In the first specimen the Supreme Being is directly introduced; a fact which marks it at once as religious, under the garb of love. The second specimen is an extract. If the Almighty is not brought into any part of it, we need not infer that the writer intended it for a devotional hymn, because the Mohammedans sung it as such. *Their application and the original scope of it may be quite different.*

The Hindoo poem, Gita-govinda, is an idyllic opera belonging to the eleventh or twelfth century of the Christian era, celebrating the love of Crishna to the shepherdesses, the separation arising therefrom, and final reconciliation with his beloved Râdhâ. The piece is sensuous and extravagant, having no religious bearing, though now interpreted mystically. It is difficult to judge of the pantheistic poems of the Sufis, and especially of Hafiz. Did these mystic poets themselves convey nothing more than a literal sense in their songs; or did they veil an allegorical and mystic one beneath the literal and sensuous? When the commentators discover another than the literal meaning, do they find what the poets themselves did not mean? We are inclined to adopt the opinion of those who believe that the poets in question, whenever they appear to convey a secret sense, employ that expedient solely to deceive their credulous and superstitious countrymen. Sir William Jones and Umbreit think so. And this is favoured by the fact that the poetry of Hafiz had no mystical sense in the eyes of the Persian doctors themselves; since Sudius, the most erudite of all the interpreters, explained it literally; and the chief men of Shiraz were reluctant to allow burial to the poet, because of the impurity of his works. Hence it is probable that Mohammedan and other commentators attributed an allegorical sense to what the Persian poets themselves wrote with no such intention. "But after all, the great objection remains to any conclusion drawn from the pantheistic mystic poets, whether of Persia or India, whether Mohammedans or Hindoos, namely, that their productions are founded on a religion and philosophy entirely different from the Jewish. The Canticles are productions of a different country, and separated from any of the songs of the Sufi poets by an interval of nearly two thousand years. The Jewish religion has nothing in common with the pantheistic mysticism on which those songs are founded. There is nothing in the Old Testament of a similar character. If any production similar to those mystical love songs had existed in the religious literature of the Hebrews, undoubtedly we should have found some of them in the book of Psalms, which comprises composi-

tions from the age preceding that of David to a period long after the return of the Jews from the captivity at Babylon. But in the most fervent psalms, the forty-second, for instance, nothing of the kind is found. Neither is anything similar to these mystic songs ascribed to the Jewish sects, as described by Josephus and Philo. Nothing of the kind is laid to the charge of the Essenes. It is needless to say that nothing approaching to a like character is found in the New Testament. Nothing similar is discovered even in the allegorical paraphrase of the Targumist on the Canticles. All those religious love songs are founded on the Sufi religion, or rather religious philosophy, which, whether it was borrowed from India, as Von Hammer supposes, or arose independently among the Mahometans, according to the opinion of Tholuck, has no connection with or resemblance to the Jewish. It is as different from the latter as darkness from light. The argument, therefore, which is drawn from the mystical songs of the Mahometan devotees for ascribing a mystical character to the Canticles is without foundation."¹

4. Every part of the Bible has a religious aspect, and is filled with theocratic views. How then came there to be an exception so contrary to the genius of the whole Hebrew Bible?

It is not a solitary exception, as the book of Esther shews. In like manner, the forty-fifth psalm is secular. Those who talk of an amatory poem in opposition to books of a serious and religious nature, forget that virtue is a part of religion. The Canticles shew the virtue of faithful and pure love. Though they be amatory in character, they set forth a kind of love which needed to be inculcated upon the sensual Jews and their voluptuous monarchs. In an age when adultery was common, it was neither inopportune nor irreverent to compose a work whose object was to set forth that virtuous love which the sexes should maintain incorrupted amid the strongest seductions. The book is worthy because of its theme to be put among the religious literature of the nation; since religion enjoins the crucifying of the flesh with its lusts. It commends the maintenance of vows and promises; especially when their violation leads directly to immorality of conduct. Among a people like the Jews, in the age of Solomon and after, the theme, if not directly spiritual, was closely allied to that pure and undefiled religion so grossly injured in the person of David's splendour-loving son.

5. The characters introduced are spiritually applied elsewhere. The covenant relation subsisting between Jehovah and the people of Israel is frequently represented by the emblematical union of

¹ Noyes's new translation of the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles, pp. 130, 131.

a married pair (Hos. i., ii., iii.; Ezek. xvi.; Jer. iii.). In like manner the relation of Christ to his church is described in the New Testament by the purest exhibition of the married state. Christ is called the Bridegroom of his people. The church is the bride, the Lamb's wife. The bride is compared to the rose and lily, which images are repeatedly applied to the church of God by different prophets (Hos. xiv. 5; Is. xxxv. 1).

In answer to this it is sufficient to remark that the poem was not meant to set forth the happiness of married love. Wedded love is not the theme so much as true affection in the midst of temptations. The basis of that allegorical interpretation which assumes the relation of Jehovah to his ancient people, or of Christ to his church, under the figure of marriage is not prominently presented. Two newly married lovers in peculiar circumstances are set forth; one of them in particular being described for the purpose of shewing the strength and purity of genuine love between the sexes.

6. "The sudden changes from the singular to the plural number in the part of the dialogue sustained by Shulamith, indicate that her name is to be taken in a collective sense. Draw *me*, *we* will run after thee. The king has brought *me* into his chambers; *we* will be glad, etc., chap. i. 4 and many other places."¹

This change from the one number to the other has nothing to do with the determination of the allegorical or literal sense of the poem, for it is very common in Hebrew to use the plural where no collective sense is intended. The argument is also based on misapprehension, the sense being "let us run," the Shulamite and her lover.

We have thus seen that the arguments drawn from the internal nature of the poem against its being considered amatory rest upon misapprehension of the meaning. It is an eastern production, and must be judged by an eastern standard of taste. He who does not remember the wide difference between the Oriental and Occidental mind, must necessarily fall into error. The luxuriant imagination and glowing ardour of the former express themselves in hyperbolical and extravagant diction; whereas the subdued character and coolness of the latter are averse to sensuous luxuriance. Although the poem has raised the devotion of a few minds in the west, and been spiritualized in the service of piety, we are far from thinking that its original design was such. A mystical interpretation has been *put into it* by the ingenuity or allegorising imagination of the expositor, instead of being fairly *derived from* its language.

¹ Kitto, Daily Bible Illustrations, evening series, thirteenth week, first day.

7. "The Shulamite is put in situations and made to utter expressions which, if literally understood, are so entirely abhorrent to Oriental manners, that no sane writer would ever put them into a literal love song; though they are all very beautiful and appropriate when understood allegorically. Such are chaps. iii. 1-4; v. 7; viii. 1, 2."¹

The situations and expressions in question are not abhorrent to Oriental manners, in an Eastern love-poem, with its gorgeous, sensuous imagery. On the contrary they are in keeping with a poem of that nature. The argument tacitly assumes that poetry is literal prose, which is unfair. How justly might it be said to the advocates of the spiritual sense, No sane writer would put such expressions into the mouth of Jehovah respecting his church, or of his church respecting Jehovah. Allegorically understood, the situations and scenes are unworthy of the great Bridegroom and his Bride.

8. "The dreamy and fanciful, and even impossible character of many of the scenes, shews that they cannot be understood literally. Chap. ii. 14-16, Shulamith is in the cleft of the rocks, in the concealments of the precipices; and Shelomoh wishes to see her and to hear her speak. He is in the garden at night; and she tells him to catch the jackals that are destroying the vines. She sees him feeding his flocks in a distant field of anemones. She sees him beyond the mountains which separate them, and calls upon him to leap over them like the gazelle and the fleeting fawn, to rejoin her at evening. All these things occur together at the same time and place. Chap. iv. 8, Shelomoh calls upon Shulamith to go with him to the snowy peaks of Lebanon and Hermon, among the lions' dens and the leopards' lairs, and enjoy the fine prospect over the plains of Damascus. Numerous impossibilities of this kind will occur to every intelligent reader of the poem."²

The alleged impossibilities are founded on a total misapprehension of the meaning. Shulamith does *not* call upon Solomon to do what is here stated. Neither does Solomon ask *her* to do what the commentator alleges. A right interpretation dispels at once the alleged phenomena. And we hold that most of the scenes cannot be understood literally, *because they are poetry*, which is the offspring of imagination.

The advocates of the mystical interpretation sometimes convey the idea that they alone take the view of it consistent with divine inspiration. But an inspired man may well have written it, though it be an amatory effusion. A poem purporting to set

¹ Kitto, Daily Bible Illustrations, evening series, thirteenth week, first day.

² Ibid.

forth the triumph of chaste love may surely have proceeded from the pen of inspiration. The book is equally a part of the canonical Scriptures of the Jews with the others to which divine authority attaches. We do not say that *the Song* is inspired, because it is improper to predicate inspiration of a book; but we say that it is the production of an inspired man. In this respect it stands in the same position as the other books of the Old Testament. "Amatory," says Stuart, "nearly all the German neologists suppose it to be." In the same spirit Hengstenberg writes: "The literal interpretation did not come into repute till the time of rationalism, the age of the deepest humiliation of Christ's church." This is an ungenerous insinuation. Amatory some very orthodox divines suppose it to be. Belief in inspiration and the divine authority of the Scriptures, has nothing to do with the view taken of the Song.

It is unnecessary to refer to any other modification of the allegorical sense, such as that of the Targum already stated; of Rashi who holds that its design was to shew that God had not afflicted Israel willingly but was still her husband; of Rashbam; of Abenezra who supposes it contains a history of the Jews from Abraham to the days of Messiah under the figure of a shepherd and shepherdess. Abarbanel and Leo Hebraeus affirm that it represents the mutual love of Solomon and Wisdom. According to Hug,¹ it is a dream poem, in which Solomon represents Hezekiah; the bride, the ten tribes; and her love, the longing of these tribes to be reunited with Judah. Kaiser supposes that the bridegroom represents Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah as the restorers of the Jewish constitution in the province of Judah, the bride being a new colony.² Hahn conjectures that the bride is Japhetic heathenism; the bridegroom the kingdom of Israel; so that the poem represents the kingdom of Israel called at last to overcome heathenism with the weapons of love and justice, and bring the heathen to a state of fellowship with it, and consequently with God.³ To the class of allegorical interpreters also belong F. A. Krummacher, O. Von Gerlach, Goltz, Hengstenberg, Keil, and Kurtz. Indeed wherever the doctrinal interest prevails, scientific exegesis declines in proportion because it is overridden. The genuine spirit of interpretation is always favourable to the literal sense. For the same reason Hofmann and Delitzsch have recourse to the typical. Though they do not recognize the validity of the allegorical method, they are too much led by doctrinal prepossessions to

¹ Das Hohelied in einer noch unversuchten Deutung.

² Das Hohelied, ein Collectiv-gesang auf Serubabel, u. s. w.

³ Das hohe Lied von Salomo, uebersetzt und erklärt, u. s. w.

embrace the literal, and are therefore fain to adopt a kindred mode of explanation.

VI. AUTHORSHIP AND AGE.—The title ascribes the poem to Solomon as its author; and this has always been the prevailing opinion. But the argument of the book refutes it. Surely the king would not have written a censure upon himself. He would not have exposed his shame in so public a manner. That he employed all his artful blandishments to seduce an innocent female is plainly declared; and he himself would not have portrayed such a fruitless and sinful attempt. Steadfast purity triumphs over the libertine conduct of the monarch; and therefore it is a psychological impossibility that he could have satirised himself. Besides, the way in which David is mentioned does not agree well with the idea of his being the author's father: "Thy neck is like the tower of David builded for an armoury," etc. (iv. 4). Solomon is also spoken of as if he had preceded the writer: "Solomon had a vineyard at Baal-hamon" (viii. 11). The title is no proof of authorship; because those prefixed to the psalms, and others in the prophetic writings were later additions and are often incorrect. Solomon would hardly have prefixed the laudatory inscription, *most excellent or surpassing song*. The writer of the title was not identical with the author of the book, for he puts שֶׁן, for שׁ in the work itself. Hence it is the title-writer alone who ascribes the book to Solomon. There is no passage in the poem intimating that the author himself wished to personate Solomon. When the wisdom and poetical ability of Solomon became famous in Judea, and the name of the poet himself had passed into oblivion, the inscription was prefixed.

Other arguments besides the title, in favour of Solomonic authorship, are neither cogent nor satisfactory. They are these:—

1. The numerous names of plants and animals, as well as other productions of nature which the poem presents, speak in favour of a poet celebrated for the wealth of his natural knowledge. And Solomon was renowned for his acquaintance with plants and animals: "he spake of trees, from the cedar tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall: he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." Thus we meet with nut, aloe tree, cedar, cypress, mandrakes, meadow saffron, el-henna, frankincense, myrrh, nard, cinnamon, lily; hind of the field, lions, kids, panthers, dove, mare, goat, stag, gazelle, roe, sheep, fox, turtle-dove. Ivory, marble, sapphire are also spoken of.

This argument is inconclusive, because others besides Solomon may have known the things specified. An observer of nature

acquainted with some of the neighbouring countries, either by travel or intercourse with others, could not have been ignorant of them.

2. There are analogies between Proverbs and the Song, which shew identity of authorship and age. Thus, v. 6, "I sought him, but I could not find him; I called him, but he gave me no answer," compared with Proverbs i. 28, "Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me." Chap. iv. 12, "A garden enclosed is my sister, my spouse; a spring shut up, a fountain sealed," compared with v. 15, etc., "Drink waters out of thine own cistern, and running waters out of thine own well. Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad, and rivers of water in the streets. . . . Let thy fountains be blessed, etc." Chap. iv. 5, "Thy two breasts are like two young roes that are twins, which feed among the lilies," compared with Prov. v. 19, "Let her be as the living hind and pleasant roe; let her breasts satisfy thee at all times; and be thou ravished always with her love." Chap. viii. 7, "Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it: if a man would give all the substance of his house for love, it would utterly be contemned," compared with Prov. vi. 31-35, "He shall give all the substance of his house . . . He will not regard any ransom; neither will he rest content, though thou givest many gifts." Chap. v. 1, "I have eaten my honeycomb with my honey; I have drunk my wine with my milk, etc.," compared with Prov. ix. 5, "Come eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled." Chap. iv. 11, "Thy lips, O my spouse, drop as the honeycomb; honey and milk are under thy tongue, etc.," compared with Prov. xvi. 24, "Pleasant words are as an honeycomb, sweet to the soul," etc. Chap. i. 11, "We will make thee borders of gold with studs of silver," compared with Prov. xxv. 11, "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver."¹

Analogies of diction are, עֵינֶיךָ מִצִּוְרֵיךָ (iv. 9) compared with Prov. i. 9, נָפֶת תַּמְפֻּנָּה שְׁפָתֶיךָ. עֵינֶיךָ לִנְרָתֶיךָ (iv. 11) compared with Prov. v. 3, נָפֶת תַּמְפֻּנָּה שְׁפָתֵי זָרָה (i. 2) compared with Prov. xxvii. 6. חָלִי (vii. 2) and Prov. xxv. 12. הִלַּךְ לְמִישְׁרִים (vii. 10) compared with Prov. xxiii. 31, הִתְהַלַּךְ בְּמִישְׁרִים. The union of קִנְמוֹן and מֶר וְאַהֲלֹת (iv. 14) compared with Prov. vii. 17.²

In answer to these observations we remark, that it is now impossible to separate what belongs to Solomon in the book of

¹ See Hengstenberg, Das Hohelied Salomonis, u. s. w. pp. 234, 235.

² Hävernick's Einleitung, l. 1., p. 214 et seqq.; Keil's Einleitung, p. 372.

Proverbs from the parts which are not his. Earlier and later portions cannot be minutely distinguished. A passage in Proverbs may be later than one in the Song. The analogies given appear to us of an uncertain nature. The closest is that in iv. 11, from which v. 3 is borrowed. Next to it is viii. 7, in its relation to Prov. vi. 30, 31. It is hard to say which of these is the original. The rest seem to be accidental. Or, if they belong to the same age, who shall prove that it was Solomon's, and not a subsequent one? Even if numerous places in which contact with the Proverbs is obvious could be pointed out, the Solomonic authorship would not be proved by that means. What is necessary to establish such a position, is the unquestionable authorship of passages in the Proverbs, imitated or copied by the author of the Song, the latter shewing that he repeated or echoed himself. Slight and few are the analogies between the two books; not sufficient to render either their contemporary origin or identity of authorship probable.

Hengstenberg also quotes in favour of the same authorship references to the Song found in the oldest prophets, particularly in Hosea, Joel, Obadiah, and Isaiah. That is inconclusive. If these prophets *do* cite the work, all that the fact would shew is its priority of composition. But none of them can be truly said to refer to it, except Hosea xiv. 6, 7, compared with ii. 1; iv. 11; also v. 15; ii. 3; vi. 11, compared with the same; and Joel iii. 3, תַּמְרוֹת עֵץ, comp. Song iii. 6; תַּפְּוֹחַ, i. 12; comp. Song ii. 3; vii. 9; iv. 18, comp. Song iv. 11, 15; v. 1.

3. The language is such as we should expect from the Solomonic age. It belongs to the flourishing period of the Hebrew tongue. Highly poetical, vigorous, and fresh, it has no traces of the decay which manifested itself in the declining period of Israel and Judah. All the Aramaean colouring it has can be best explained on other grounds than comparative lateness.

This argument does not prove that Solomon himself wrote the Song, but merely shews that it appeared either in his time, or not long after. We have already seen that it could not have been written while *he* was alive; and therefore the language fixes it at no distant date subsequently.

VII. TIME AND PLACE.—In determining the time after Solomon when the poem was written, various particulars are noticeable. Tirzah, where the first Israelite kings dwelt, is mentioned before Jerusalem. But this city remained the head of the kingdom of Israel only till Omri, *i.e.*, about 918 B.C. Hence the book was composed before that time (1 Kings xvi. 23, etc.). It was also written previously to the event spoken of in 1 Kings xv. 20, *i.e.*,

¹ Das Hohelied Salomonis ausgelegt, u. s. w. p. 235.

before the tenth year of Asa. The tower of David had still a garrison (iv. 4); and the tower of Lebanon, which looked towards Damascus, is a prominent object in the landscape (vii. 4). The descriptions of Solomon himself and what was in his time, are fresh and life-like, as though they proceeded from one not far removed from the scenes themselves. Tradition had not yet magnified particulars, as it did at a later period. It had not run through phases of enlargement. Thus Solomon had only sixty queens and eighty concubines (vi. 8); whereas in 1 Kings xi. 3, they had been magnified into seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines. Thus everything points to a date soon after Solomon. Probably about the middle of the tenth century B.C. is as near as we can come to it. Hitzig cannot be very far from the truth in placing it from twenty-five to thirty years after the death of Solomon, 950-946 B.C.¹ Weissbach arrives at 919-884 as the time in which the work received its present form, chiefly by means of comparing it with the forty-fifth psalm, which he supposes to have appeared soon after, and to have been written either by the same author, or by one who had the song before him.² The time of the psalm is too precarious a thing to be relied upon. It may have been composed soon after Jehu ascended the throne, *i.e.*, about 884 B.C. The coincidences between it and the Song are considerable in ideas, and still more in words. This resemblance was observed even by the author of the title, who has שִׁיר יִירְדוֹת from perhaps also עַל-שִׁשְׁנַיִם from ii. 1, 2; v. 13.

The author was a member of the northern kingdom. To Judah he could not have belonged on account of the subject. There kings sprung from Solomon reigned; and there that monarch was held in great estimation. His memory was cherished and praised. A poet living there would not have ventured to put him in an inferior light. On the contrary, one belonging to the kingdom of Israel might shew how the blandishments even of such a monarch could not corrupt true love. It is remarkable that the name of Jehovah is absent from the Song. In the neighbourhood of the splendid temple with its numerous priests and imposing ritual, an inhabitant of Jerusalem could scarcely have refrained from some allusion to the building. The writer repeatedly mentions Lebanon (iv. 8), and places in the northern kingdom with which he was familiar.

The Aramaean complexion of the language has often been adduced in favour of a late period, a Persian or post-exile one. It is remarkable how many have been misled in this way; not

¹ Das hohe Lied erklärt, Vorbemerkungen, pp. 10, 11.

² Das hohe Lied Salomo's erklärt, u. s. w. p. 53 et seqq.

only Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Umbreit, Rosenmüller, Kaiser, Hartmann, and Herbst, but Koester and Magnus. The so-called Aramaeisms are explained by the writer's place of abode, not by the amatory character of the fiction which attaches itself to the language of ordinary discourse more than the diction of lyrical or prophetic poetry. The constant use of the relative **שֶׁ**, and the change of the sibilant letters **ש** and **ז** into the dentals **ת** **ם**, as **ברות** for **ברוש** i. 17 and **נטר** for **נצר** i. 6; viii. 11, 12 confirm this. The uniform insertion of the *yod* in all copies, in the orthography of the name David **דָּוִיד** for **דָּוִד** which is a later orthography, is found in Amos (vi. 5; ix. 11) and Hosea (iii. 5), who prophesied in the kingdom of Israel. There is in short no word, form, or expression which really betrays a late and degenerate epoch of the language. As well might the song of Deborah be brought down to the time of the captivity or later, because of the prefix **שׁ** occurring in it, as the Canticles be similarly reduced. That relative came early into use in northern Palestine; and therefore it is found in the part of Judges relating to Gideon, as well as in the song of Deborah, both composed in that part of the country. We are aware of Magnus's acute remarks in opposition to this explanation of the language by the locality,¹ but are unable to assent to his conclusion any more than to Gesenius's opinion of the late date as shewn by the character of the diction.²

After these observations it is unnecessary to allude to the arguments of such as bring down the date till the captivity or after. The Aramaean colouring of the language is otherwise explained; and neither **פָּרְדָּם** (iv. 13), which is of Eastern Asiatic origin, nor **אֶפְרַיִן** (iii. 9), which is not taken from the Greek *φορείον*, but from **פָּרָה** (*φέρω*), shews that the Song was written in the Persian or Greek dynasty. There is no doubt that former critics, as Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller, Kaiser, Hartmann, Koester, and Magnus erred in their estimate of the time when the work originated, because they relied too much on the Aramacising complexion of the language, overlooking the entire genius of it, which is natural, full, round, easy, and light in its movement, spirited and original. Without imitation, artificial stiffness, or the feeble diffuseness of decay, it is masterly and appropriate. The poem breathes a clear freshness and repose throughout; while the diction corresponds to the key-note of the whole, without lagging or overlading.

VIII. FORM OF THE WORK.—The *form* of the work has been variously described. That it has something dramatic is apparent.

¹ Bearbeitung und Erklärung des II. I. p. 43.

² Geschichte der Hebr. Sprache und Schrift, p. 26.

Hence Bossuet, followed by Lowth,¹ supposes it to be an *epithalamium* or nuptial dialogue, divided into seven parts corresponding to the seven days of the feast celebrated on such occasions. The last day is distinguished as the sabbath, on which the bridegroom does not go forth as usual to his rural occupation, but proceeds from the marriage chamber into public with his bride (viii. 4-14). According to this view it is not a *proper* drama, but belongs to that inferior species of drama characterised by *dialogue*, in which the conversation is carried on by the persons themselves without the intervention of the poet; like the eclogues of Theocritus and Virgil. It approaches, however, the Greek drama in having a chorus of virgins corresponding to the tragic chorus of the Greeks. But the poem cannot be regarded as a regular drama. It does not contain an entire plot or action in which the connected incidents proceed regularly from one another to a perfect conclusion. There are not proper acts, though Ewald distinguishes five of them, as in the Greek drama. He resorts to transposition for the purpose.² Nor are there thirteen scenes as Stäudlin³ makes out, which Ewald converts into so many sections. There is no regular development. Passages like those in iv. 1, etc.; v. 10-16; vii. 2, etc., belong to descriptive poetry; while others resemble the idyll, as vii. 12-14; ii. 11 etc.; and ii. 8-17 is essentially lyric. Chap. viii. 6, 7, is both lyric and didactic. These considerations justify the opinion of Lowth, who affirms that it cannot, on any fair grounds, be accounted a regular drama.

To say with Bossuet that it is an *epithalamium* or nuptial dialogue, in which the principal characters are Solomon himself and his bride, who are represented speaking both in dialogue, and in soliloquy when accidentally separated, appears to us as incorrect as to call it a drama. Nor can we hold with Sir William Jones⁴ and Mason Good,⁵ that it is a collection of idylls, forming one whole. The poetry is of the pastoral kind, because the principal personages are represented in the character of shepherds. Hoelemann's phrase comes nearest the true character of the work, viz., a *dramatic idyll*. This is better than Lowth's *sacred pastoral drama*.

The song is a poem of love, in which certain persons are introduced for the purpose of setting forth the constancy and fidelity of the pure passion existing between the sexes. The principal characters speak and act according to their situation, with all the fervour of Oriental manners. The scope and design are

¹ De Sacra poesi Hebraeorum praelectiones Academicæ, xxx. xxxi.

² Jahrbuch, 1849, p. 49.

³ In Paulus's Memorabilia 2.

⁴ Poeses Asiaticæ Commentarii, cap. iii., works, vol. vi. p. 71, 8vo. ed.

⁵ Song of Songs, or Sacred Idylls, translated from the Hebrew with notes; preface,

to depict the heroism of wedded love in humble life. The virtue of faithful affection tried by a severe test is commended. An innocent shepherdess, true to her bridal lover, resists the flatteries of the greatest monarch, and is sent to her home unscathed. Thus while the happiness and constancy of nuptial love are strongly painted, polygamy is indirectly censured. Impure affection is discouraged; and steadfast chastity held forth as a pattern by shewing its successful issue. Virtue triumphs over vice. Though glances are afforded us of the voluptuous pleasures of the harem, it is forsaken by innocence. Who shall say that the chaste affections implanted by the Deity in the human heart, and on which much of human happiness depends, is unworthy of a muse divinely inspired? Does it not deserve to be celebrated as a subject of gratitude to the great Author of happiness? The interests of morality are bound up with religion. Is it not then conducive to the spread and maintenance of religion to recommend such a pattern of purity to mankind as they are only too averse to follow in a luxurious age? Because the poem is fraught with moral instruction it is fully entitled to the honour of belonging to sacred scripture.

So far from "consistently lamenting the presence of such a book in the Bible," as Kitto erroneously affirms of those who regard it as a song of human affection, we hold it to be *rightly* in the sacred volume. It is worthy of the place it occupies, just because it treats of virtuous love. We admit that the ideal of love derives its chief force, as represented in the poem, from the impression made by corporeal beauty not spiritual or moral qualities; but this is no defect in a Hebrew poet. It is rather in harmony with the dispensation and race to which he belonged. In a christian point of view the deficiency is apparent. A great advance has been made since the introduction of our better system, in the views entertained of love between the sexes; chiefly in consequence of monogamy being strictly enjoined. Under the Old Testament it was not considered disgraceful for a woman to yield herself up to the love of a king. The conduct of Esther and many other virgins in relation to the Persian king, is narrated as an unobjectionable thing; and the book of Ruth shews the kind of feelings which were justified by the family tie. If such be the spirit of the Jewish dispensation, the author of the Song was a man in some respects before his time; because his standard of purity was higher than most. Whether it had a historical basis is uncertain. The main circumstances *may have* occurred. The royal successor of David *may have* got a beautiful shepherdess into his power, and tried all his seductive arts upon her unsuccessfully, because she was attached to a bridegroom shepherd, who on his part was as firmly

united to her. Unflinching in her virtue she may have been delivered from the monarch's court, and hastened away to her husband. An incident of this kind, handed down by tradition, may have become the foundation of the poem. Yet we believe that the story is *fictitious*. Whoever the poet was, he was actuated by no favourable feeling towards Solomon. He holds him up to view in no enviable light; shewing a degree of political freedom which a Jew of the southern kingdom would scarcely have done. But as he belonged to Ephraim, which was separated from Judah, he could easily do so with immunity. On the contrary, Ruth was written to do honour to the house of David. There we see the opposite feeling expressed; and infer that the writer himself belonged to Judah. Impurity in the person of Solomon had reached an imposing height. Amid the corruption of courts virtuous love was fast disappearing. Kings discouraged it by their conduct; generals and nobles were indifferent to its claims. A poet of the people appears to express the feelings of many humble Jews, who, living amid the innocent occupations of rural life, were not dazzled by royal splendour into suppression of their higher instincts.

Every writing inspired by God is also profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Such is the statement of Paul. The Song of Solomon may justly claim to be profitable for reproof and correction, even amid the light of Christianity. Much more so must it have been under Judaism with its imperfect morality.

IX. UNITY.—Though the older interpreters generally recognised an unity in the Song, Richard Simon could perceive nothing but fragments or pieces by different authors. Herder looked upon it as composed of love songs loosely connected, without a predominant idea controlling the whole and shewing a higher plan. Yet he did not entirely deny the existence of a fine, invisible thread. De Wette appears to have followed Herder in this opinion. Dr. Good and Sir William Jones also think that there is no close unity; believing, as they do, that a number of erotic idylls make up the poem. The Americans, Palfrey and Noyes, take the same view. Doepke and Magnus, the latter in particular (who makes twenty pieces, complete and fragmentary), have carried this opinion to an extreme length. Among those who strove to find a proper unity in the poem may be mentioned Jacobi, Mendelssohn, and Ammon. The commentary of Ewald (1826) was an epoch-making one, both in relation to the unity and interpretation of the poem. Accordingly Hirzel, Meier, Friederich, Heiligstedt, Hitzig, Ginsburg, Keil, Hengstenberg, and others have admitted its internal

unity. In favour of it we mention the following considerations:—

1. The inscription *Song of Songs*, referring to the whole as one poem.

2. Various recurring formulas appear, such as the triple adjuration of the daughters of Jerusalem not to awaken the beloved one, ii. 7; iii. 5; viii. 4, the analogous formulas, ii. 17; viii. 14; iv. 6 and ii. 16, compared with vi. 3.

3. The same persons appear throughout in the same relations, the beloved maiden, her shepherd lover, Solomon, the daughters of Jerusalem, the maiden's brothers, etc.; and where they are described it is by the same phrases. Thus the shepherd lover is termed **דָּוִד** and **שְׂאֵהֲבָה נֶפֶשׁ** i. 13, 14, 16; ii. 3, 8-10, 16, 17; iv. 16; v. 2-6, 8, 10, 16; vi. 2, 3, 7, 10-12, 14; viii. 14; and i. 7; iii. 1-4. The spouse is **כְּלָה** iv. 8, 11; or **אֶחָתִי כְלָה**, or **רַעֲיָתִי** ii. 10, 13, comp. v. 2, vi. 9; or **הַיָּפָה בְּנָשִׁים** i. 8; v. 9; vi. 1.

4. A number of statements are repeated which did not originate in imitation; comp. iv. 1 and v. 12 with i. 15; v. 8 with ii. 5; viii. 3 with ii. 6.

5. A number of characteristic expressions and images are found in all parts of the poem, as **מִי זֶאת וְגו'** iii. 6; vi. 10; viii. 5. **עֲפָרִים תְּאֻמִּי צְבִיָּה** ii. 16; iv. 5; vi. 3, etc. **עֵפֶר הָאֵלִים** ii. 9, 17; viii. 14. **שֶׁל** prefixed, i. 6; iii. 7; viii. 12. **רַעֲיָתִי** i. 9, etc., which occurs elsewhere only in Judg. xi. 37. **סִמְרָר** ii. 13, 15; vii. 13. **כֶּפֶר** *cypress*, i. 14; iv. 13.

6. A comparison of the two sections, iii. 1-5 and v. 2-8, both in their similarity and diversity, also favours the unity.

7. The same colouring of language distinguishes the poem throughout, such as **שֶׁ** regularly for **אֲשֶׁר**, which occurs in such frequency only in the Lamentations of Jeremiah.

Thus the unity of the poem is well attested by similarity of subject, scope, repetitions of sentiments not containing imitations, phrases, figures, and words throughout, characteristic of the same author. It is unnecessary to shew that the concluding verses, viii. 8-14, are authentic, in opposition to Herder and Umbreit. The kind of unity, however, may be readily misapprehended. The poet representing an imaginary scene and not writing a drama, has been indifferent to localities and times. Hence scarcely any progress is observable. The development is almost the same throughout. He had one leading idea and no plot. He sings his song of love, heedless of regular succession and

artistic progress. This is the reason why the poem has the appearance of being made up of a number of little odes loosely strung together. Speakers, places, and times are not distinguished. We are therefore left to conjecture in many cases; and are in danger of introducing closer unity into it than the writer himself dreamt of. The very first time the shepherd speaks, his introduction is abrupt. It would almost seem as if the author wrote little pieces, and put them together afterwards. At all events, he does not construct the whole with regard to the proper succession of time. Thus vi. 11-vii. 9 refers to the time when the Shulamite was first seen by Solomon in her native district, before she was taken to Jerusalem. At the commencement the locality is rather uncertain, some supposing the scene to occur in the harem at Jerusalem, others at the royal pavilion in the country. The latter is favoured by the fifth and sixth verses. There is thus ground for the assertion of those who deny coherence and strict unity in the Song. It was not the author's object to follow the just order of events. On the contrary, he pursued the one thing through several little poems, the love of a country maiden for her shepherd-bridegroom, and Solomon's multiplied blandishments to tempt her. Hence we do not agree with such as find out a fine thread of connection between all the parts so that progress may appear in the plot, with times and places corresponding. There are both unity and disunion; the one not tantamount to strict coherence, the other not to dismemberment. Into the one extreme have fallen such critics as Ewald, Meier, Ginsburg, etc.; into the other, Palfrey, Noyes, and especially Magnus, who finds a great number of pieces written by different persons. As an example of the close connection put into the poem, we may instance the manner of linking ii. 8 to the preceding. The ill treatment the Shulamite had received from her brothers being mentioned in i. 6, she now relates the cause of it. It is supposed that this narrative forms the connecting link between ii. 8 and the preceding section i.-ii. 7, gradually acquainting us with her history. Here is ingenuity on the part of modern critics. As an example of dismemberment, we take iii. 6-v. 1, which is supposed by some to celebrate Solomon's espousals to one of the daughters of Jerusalem. But that separates the piece from all the rest, where the fidelity of love is the theme.

PROPHECY.

I. PROPHETS GENERALLY.—Speaking generally, prophets may be described as persons who perceive the will and counsel of God respecting the destinies of men, in any way and by any signs whatever. Nor do they merely *apprehend* His will; they explain and announce it. Such is the broad generic meaning of the term *prophet*. In a more limited sense, we call those prophets who are confidants of God; to whom he has revealed Himself that they may communicate His will to mankind. They are thus messengers or heralds,—persons who speak on God's behalf. Prophecy, accordingly, has two sides or aspects. Its operation appears in a twofold manner. The one side relates to the Deity. This is the inner side, or the way in which the prophets apprehend the will of God, and the state of soul into which they are put in consequence. The other side is the outward direction or tendency. This includes the mode in which they announce what has been revealed to them, the method of their ministry, and their position among men.

II. PROPHECY GENERALLY.—Let us consider prophecy as a public institution; and its religious conditions.

Prophecy, or something analogous to it, is found in the religion of almost all nations ancient and modern. We must remember, however, that it exists only as long as religion stands on its proper, original basis. While it is a thing of feeling, or in other words has its foundation in the heart not the head, it occupies its true element. As long as consciousness is an immediate and living principle—God being regarded as a living, active Spirit not a mere idea, and man as standing in living communion with him—religion keeps its own place. With such a basis, it presents two aspects. It is the feeling of unconditional dependence on God as a higher Power,—a Power whom man feels to be operative both in his destiny and heart, meeting and guiding him in all the events of life. In its other aspect

religion is longing after God as the highest good, produced by such a feeling. It is the striving to please and serve him as well as to procure his favour; and if that favour have been lost, to become reconciled to him. In a word, it is a craving of the soul to have and possess such a Deity. The former is faith; the latter, worship. One is so to speak, the *passive*, the other, the *active* side of communion with the Supreme. Hence religion is living communion with God, including *faith* and *worship*. When faith is a genuine principle, feeling God living and potential within, it includes a double conviction, viz., that the Deity knows events in nature as well as in human life; because nothing takes place without His notice and will; because He acts with consciousness, not as a blind power; and because He knows beforehand whatever comes to pass, since it proceeds from His own free will and counsel. There is also the conviction that He has not left His purposes unknown to men; but has revealed Himself, with the object of leading them to Him. Hence right faith implies belief in *God's revelation* as the source of all knowledge of divine things. Now prophecy in general consists in laying hold of such revelation; in understanding and explaining it. It is nothing else than an unfolding of the divine will revealed. All, however, are not capable of such a function. Sin has separated between God and man. The present condition of humanity is not only imperfect but deteriorated. A higher endowment is needed to qualify individuals for the work in question. Only a few are constitutionally predisposed to it,—men chosen by God, to whom He reveals himself more intimately, that they may be instruments of making His will known to others. Such are *mediators* of the divine communications, coming between God and man to bring them into union. They are *prophets* in the more limited sense of the term.

Having thus alluded to faith as one element of religion, we must glance at the practical side, or worship. Here there is intercourse with God. Man comes to him in a childlike spirit; as was the case in a state of innocence. Such access to the Supreme Being shews itself in action by offerings of love and thankfulness. But it is now obstructed or made difficult by the feeling of sin. An evil conscience frightens the sinner, holding him back from a trusting approach to his Heavenly Father. Hence access to God is effected by the mediation of holy persons, or priests. The relation between the two classes of mediators is, that prophets stand on the way which brings God near to humanity; priests, on the way that leads humanity to God. The former have to do with the divine revelations, adapting them as it were to the apprehension of men; the latter with the service of their fellow men to God. These intermediates have

their function and significance only so long as religion continues to be a living intercourse with God. While access to him is still free, their function remains. But as soon as the sum of the impressions received from God is gradually put together into a *clear conception* of the understanding, and loses its power; when the God-consciousness ascends from the heart to the head, and feeling is converted into scientific knowledge; as life cools down and heat becomes light, so that a dead knowledge takes possession of the mind, prophecy comes to an end. For civilisation brings with it head-religion. And when prophets cease, the priesthood attains to great, unhappily to injurious, power.

Prophecy differs according to its objects and modes of mediation. These again depend on man's culture and development. Two stages of it in particular may be perceived. The lowest is that in which man, wishing only for sensuous good and fearing sensuous evil, brings his offerings accordingly. Here he asks counsel of God merely in relation to undertakings belonging to the immediate future. The higher stage is that in which God has become a moral power to men—the judge or moral governor of the world—and their life is intimately united with the moral order pervading that world. In this case man is able to ask the Supreme for light respecting his proper position as a being of action and aspiration. And not only is he fit for such striving; he is also inclined to the right and true. Till he rise to the proper idea of humanity and put God's providence in connexion with it, he will not seek after or perceive the all-embracing plan of the world: neither will revelation contain for him universal religious truths and produce a theology. Such are the objects determining the means of prophecy. In its lowest grade there are divine operations in nature, portents and prodigies, auguries and omens, which were believed in ancient times to precede events and to indicate the will of God. But such signs were only connected with certain localities. Nothing but outward and practical questions could be solved by them. In the higher stage, divine communications may be made to the human spirit in a symbolical mode, in the feelings, in dreams and ecstasies, or in a state of calm consciousness. And just as in the case of the lower stage these communications may either be connected with definite places (as the oracle at Delphi) by whose nature they are conditioned; or they are a free personal privilege, an endowment imparted to particular men, classes, or families. This revelation is *artificial* in the one case; in the other it is *inspiration*. It is artificial prophecy, artistic soothsaying, and such like; or *ἀρετος*, *inartificial*, according as it is derived from nature or man himself. The explanation of both is *ἐρμηνεία*, *interpretation*. Such interpretation is sometimes.

united with inspiration in the same person, as in the case of Joseph and Balaam (Gen. xl., xli.; Num. xxiii., xxiv.).

Like revelation, inspiration has a more restricted and a freer range. This diversity depends on the relation of the two factors or acting powers in the soul. In all states of mind, the two chief factors are *feeling* and *understanding*. The former is a condition of excitement, the latter of clear consciousness. The one arises from the subject being filled and hurried along; the other from the subject directing and regulating the impression received, while reflecting it. Either emotion or intellect has the mastery of the soul. Besides the two there is an intermediate state, that of *animation*, when spiritual contemplation is awakened. The soul is then between *feeling* and *reflection*. This condition is the diagonal of the two others—the middle line, as it were, between rest and motion, and may be termed *vibration*. It is to this that prophetic inspiration belongs. Religious ideas call it forth, such as the idea of God as the highest good; and of divine things allied to man's higher nature. Of course feeling is a main factor in this condition, as most appellations applied to it attest. All include the idea of great power brought to bear upon man. It is said, for example, that the spirit of God *lifts up, takes away, drives, pushes, fills, draws in*, the subject of its influence. The hand of God grasps him (Jer. xx. 7; Ezek. iii. 14) in Greek *λαμβάνεσθαι, φέρεσθαι*. Both factors are seldom of equal power. One or other is more potential. Either *feeling* or *spirit* prevails; power of inspiration or clearness of idea, giving rise to the principal degrees of prophecy. There is first a lower stage, when feeling is wholly overpowered by the divine influence, the person's own life and self-consciousness being so pressed down that there is no counter operation of the understanding. In this condition he is possessed (*κατέχεται*), is *put out of himself* as it were (*ἐξιστάται*), and quite carried away to the object which holds and almost absorbs him. This is called *rapt*, when the state is momentary, or *ecstasy* in a more confined sense. Here again there is a good and bad form. One may be *rapt* or *transported* either to his advancement in the divine life, or to the injury of his mental powers. The expression *deranged* is employed when the state is permanent, or when the spirit does not return to its usual condition. Philo says: "As long as the understanding still gives light about us, pouring out as it were a noonday of splendour into the whole soul, we are not possessed, because we are still in our senses; but when this light verges towards its decline, a divine ecstasy naturally falls upon us, and a prophetic furor. For when the divine light begins to shine, the human sets; and when again the former sets, this springs forth and rises.

Which is wont to happen to the prophetic order. For the understanding in us takes its departure at the arrival of the divine Spirit; and on the withdrawal of the latter, the former enters in again to take up its abode; since it is not fitting that the divine and human should dwell together."¹ Similarly, and still more at length, are the expressions of Cicero:² "When therefore the mind has been called away by sleep from the fellowship and contact of the body, it remembers the past, perceives the present, foresees the future. For the body of one asleep lies as if it were dead; while, on the contrary, the soul is alive and vigorous, which it will be much more after death, when it has left the body altogether. Hence it is much diviner at the approach of death." And soon after: "There is therefore in souls a foreboding infused from without and shut up divinely. When it burns forth more vigorously, it is termed *furor*, the soul torn away from the body being agitated by a divine instinct." So also in another place: "Souls awake serve the necessities of life, and separate themselves from divine communion, being hindered by the bondage of the body." In the same chapter he says: "Nor does the soul of man ever divine naturally, unless when it is so disengaged and at liberty as to have nothing to do with the body, a thing that takes place either in prophets or persons asleep." The result of such divine impulsion is, that man loses the use of his powers and is fast bound (Num. xxiv. 4, 16; 1 Sam. xix. 23, 24). The possessed party either lies in a state of sleep (compare the *cubatio* in the temples of antiquity), which is called *magnetic* sleep; or he is shaken by convulsions. Hence an epileptic person is treated as holy in the East. He is *sacer, sacred*. The name applied to this condition is *μωρσθαί, to be mad, μάρως*; in Hebrew, *מָדוּן* (1 Sam. xxi. 16; Deut. xxviii., 34). The condition is strange to us at the present day. But we should think of ancient times and oriental characteristics when feeling was predominant. *Now* self-consciousness has too great sway. The appearance of the prophet

¹ Quis rer. div. haeres. Opp. Tom. i. p. 511, ed. Mangey.

² Quum ergo est somno evocatus animus a societate et a contagione corporis, tum meminit praeteritorum, praesentia cernit, futura praevidet. Jacet enim corpus dormientis ut mortui; viget autem et vivit animus. Quod multo magis faciet post mortem, quum omnino corpore excesserit. Itaque appropinquante morte multo est divinius (De Divinatione xxx., § 63).

Inest igitur in animis praesagium extrinsecus injecta atque inclusa divinitus. Ea si exarsit acrius, furor appellatur, quum a corpore animus abstractus divino instinctu concitatur (xxxi. § 66).

Sed vigilantes animi vitae necessitatibus serviunt, disjunguntque se a societate divina, vinculis corporis impediti (xlix. § 110).

Nec vero unquam animus hominis naturaliter divinat nisi quum ita solutus est et vacuus, ut ei plane nihil sit cum corpore. Quod aut vatibus contingit, aut dormientibus (Ibid).

presents something incomprehensible: we can only account for it in part. It must be explained by the degree of self-culture peculiar to the inquirer into nature, the condition of the orientals, and the novelty of religious ideas. Among rude people, *feeling* rules. Their ideas are few but strong; and fall like electric sparks, sudden and vehement, into the darkness of human gropings after the divine.¹ Here there is a state of immediate perception, which takes place either in vision or symbolical actions. What we read of the Pythian priestess is of this nature. Most of the Greek oracles belong to the same class. In like manner the Shamans of rude heathen people illustrate it. In these Shamans, who form a kind of order, we recognise the germ of a priesthood. A similar class is found amongst almost all nations occupying a certain stage of the religious life. The French put them under the general appellation *Jongleurs*. The Tartar word, however, is more appropriate.² In the New Testament the speaking with tongues corresponds to the same condition; where calm consciousness was absent

The higher stage of prophetic inspiration is associated with consciousness, which controls the spirit's excitement. It becomes clear knowledge, pouring itself forth in intelligent words. This gives us the notion implied in *the word of God*. It often appears, however as an interpretation of the lower stage of prophecy or of the visions there received, of riddles and obscure symbols. When St. Paul says, "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" (1 Cor. xiv. 32), the allusion to this kind of prophetic inspiration is apparent. These prophets are the *exegetes* (ἐξηγηταί), *interpreters* (ἐρμηνευταί) of the lower stage. The same distinction is also found among the Greeks; for example, in Plato and Chrysostom, who put a difference between μάντις and προφήτης. It is characteristic of the former to be out of himself, to suffer impulsion, to be pushed, dragged, drawn, like one out of his senses. But the prophet is not to be conceived of in that manner. *He* makes all his announcements with sober consciousness and mental composure. This holds good even etymologically. Μάντις comes from μαινομαι, *to be mad*. And it is confirmed by Plato himself, who says generally that God gave μαντική to human unconsciousness, and that the prophets were interpreters of the μάντις.⁴ No one who is in the state we call *understanding* receives a real and divine

¹ Comp. Ewald, Die Propheten des alten Bundes, erster Band, p. 9.

² De Wette, Ueber die Religion, pp. 223-232.

³ See Schulz's Die Geistesgaben der ersten Christen; and Neander's Die Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche, vol. i. p. 19, fourth edition.

⁴ Timaeus, 72 B.

truth. He gets it only in sleep, when the power of reflection is bound up, or in sickness, or in a rapt state. It is the part of the thoughtful man to remember and apprehend what has been spoken in sleep or in a dream, as well as what has happened in vision; to determine and explain its import; *how* it stands in relation to past, present, or future, and *when* it indicates these temporal relations. The *coming to know* belongs only to a man who is sound-minded. Hence it was customary to set the prophets to judge of divine inspirations in their contemporaries. Some call the prophets of this order *μάντεις*, not knowing that the latter saw but in enigmas. Cicero speaks of the same distinction between the *μάντεις* and *προφῆται*.¹ In referring to the second class he calls them *explanatores*, whom he places in such a relation to the first class as *grammarians* bear to *poets*. So far Plato and Cicero noted the difference of the two kinds of prophecy. Care must be taken not to confound the second stage with a state of reflection or of mere intelligent consciousness, where inspiration does not exist, for prophecy is not there. Cicero speaks of the latter condition in his *De Divinatione*, cap. xlix.

III. HEBREW PROPHECY.—The leading name of the Old Testament prophet is *נָבִיא* a term whose primary signification is disputed. It is natural for one to find in it the idea of action. The prophets are God's *speakers* or *orators*. Hence some have discovered in the term the notion of *prophetic activity*, the utterance of a revelation made; the same meaning in fact as belongs to the Greek word *προφήτης*. In order to elicit this signification, its root has been viewed as identical with *נִיב* to *spring* or *flow forth*, to *boil up*. Such is Redslob's opinion.² *נָבִיא* would then be tantamount to *spouter*, one *putting forth words*. Yet it cannot mean the prophetic activity itself, as is usually thought, but only a condition of soul whence that activity first springs. This may be inferred from its passive form, as also from the verb *נָבָא* never appearing in an active sense, but merely in *niphal* and *hithpael*, i.e., as passive and reflexive. Their usage and construction confirm our opinion. *נָבָא* and *הִתְנַבָּא* denote, in the first place, the state of being seized by a divine spirit or some other. Hence the verb signifies the condition of inspiration, as in Num. xi. 25, where it is applied to Moses and the seventy elders. In like manner *הִתְנַבָּא* is used of the two men Eldad and Medad, who remained in the camp (xi. 26). This is still more apparent where the spirit comes upon Saul and his company and they prophesy (1 Sam. x. 5,

¹ De Divinatione, chaps. xxx., xlix., li.

² Der Begriff des Nabi oder des sogenannt. Propheten bei den Hebr. 1839.

etc.). The spirit of Saul himself was seized by the Spirit of God. In like manner it is related in 1 Sam. xix. that a company under the presidency of Samuel, *prophesied* on the ground; and their condition was communicated to all who entered into their circle. Accordingly Saul himself stripped off his clothes and prophesied (וִיתְנַבֵּא) as he lay on the ground (xix. 24). We also read of the priests of Baal challenged by Elijah, that "they cried aloud and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets till the blood gushed out upon them. And it came to pass when midday was past, that they prophesied (וִיתְנַבֵּא) until the time of the offering of the evening sacrifice," etc. (1 Kings xviii. 28, 29). Here it appears that the verb in hithpacl expresses earnest strivings to receive a divine inspiration. Still farther, in Joel iii. 1, etc., is a Messianic prophecy representing young men and maidens receiving the Spirit of God, and *prophesying* (נָבֵא). These and other instances of the use of נָבֵא may serve to shew that the sense of *uttering* what has been inspired by God is not everywhere applicable. The condition implied may be also produced by an evil spirit. Such was Saul's case, after the good spirit left him (1 Sam. xviii. 10), where we see that the inspiration was the source of his anger. Hence the word נָבֵא is construed with בָּ, *by*, used of the inspiring Deity, as in Jer. ii. 8; xxiii. 13; Greek, *μαλθεσθαι ἐκ θεοῦ* or *ἀπὸ θεοῦ*. The manifestation of such inspiration consisted in extraordinary gestures of an epileptic nature, accompanied with unintelligible, raving tones. This accounts for מְשֻׁעָ one *raving* or *mad*, *frenzied*, a nickname given to the true prophets in 2 Kings ix. 11. The highest point which the manifestation reached was a song (1 Sam. x. 5). Such is the usage of the verb נָבֵא. The signification of נְבִיא as a passive participle corresponds to the participle of niphal and hithpacl, "he who is in an inspired state," *an inspired man*, *a bearer of the divine spirit*, and therefore אִישׁ הָרוּחַ *a man of the spirit*, i.e., of God's Spirit (comp. Num. xi. 25, etc.; 1 Sam. x. 5, and xix. 19, etc.). The word is next used of the permanent relations of this inspiration, or the so-called *prophetic order*, and therefore it means an official, sacred mediator between heaven and earth, as the prophets of Baal and Astarte constituted an order. Thus in 1 Kings xviii., where the 450 are called *prophets*; and xxii. 6, where 400 prophesy about war against Ramoth-Gilead. And since this relation presupposes a nearer and more confidential intercourse with God, the term is employed in a wider sense, so as to include any friend of God. Thus it is applied to Abraham (Gen. xx. 7) and the patriarchs (Ps. cv. 15). Such application

of the name would be quite impossible, according to the usual assumption that the word properly denotes *speakers* or *interpreters* of God's will. We conclude therefore that the prophets are called נְבִיאִים, not with respect to their *announcing*, but *receiving* revelations. Koester has perceived this passive signification, and renders the word, a man *taught* or *instructed* (by God), which is scarcely the true meaning.¹ Redslob likewise takes it passively, deriving it from נָבַע *to gush forth*, נְבִיא one caused (by God) to gush forth. But Ewald, Gesenius, Hävernick, Oehler, and Bleek, erroneously assign an active sense, as if the idea of *uttering* inspirations were primary. What then is the fundamental signification of נְבִיא? This will best appear from the etymology of another word נָאֵם, from נָאֵם synonymous with נָהַם *to mutter, murmur*. The proper idea of it lies in the ה. Both words mean *to bubble, murmur, to speak in a low voice* into one's ear, *to whisper*: of divine revelations especially, *to whisper or breathe into the ear, susurro, inspiro*. Hence the participle passive נָאֵם *breathed into, what is whispered*. It stands in the construct state in connection with the genitive of the author, and always before *Jehovah*, נָאֵם יְהוָה. Jer. xxiii. 31 is remarkable, for we find there נָאֵם יְהוָה נָאֵם *they mutter an oracle*. Here is the transition from the idea of the thing inspired or breathed into that of uttering what has been so communicated. With נָאֵם, נְבִיא is synonymous. Hence the latter, which is also a participle passive, but masculine, is equivalent to *inspiratus, one breathed into*, into whom something is whispered, who is accustomed to receive a divine utterance. From this passive sense arises its construction with לִיהוָה, 2 Kings iii. 11. A second sense was derived from the fundamental sense of נְבִיא just given. As the prophets received divine inspirations, that they might announce them to men, the word came to mean such an *announcer* or *mouth-piece* of God. So in Deut. xviii. 18, "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto me, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." Hence in the second part of Isaiah, prophets are called *interpreters, mediators, מְלִיץ*, ἐξηγητής (Isaiah xliii. 27). A classic passage for this sense is Exodus iv. 16, where the relation between Moses and Aaron is specially defined, and described as similar to that subsisting between God and the prophets,—inspiration on the one side, utterance on the other. Aaron was to receive his inspiration from Moses. So also Exodus vii. 1 "And the Lord said unto

¹ Die Propheten des alten und neuen Testaments, p. 183.

Moses: See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh: and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." Here it denotes an *utterer of revelations received*, which is a secondary sense. And in this relation of the two brothers we have a case of *mediate* inspiration. Moses's was immediate; Aaron's came through Moses. The prophet was therefore the ἐρμηνευτής, *interpreter* of the μάντις, who was in an unconscious condition. It is easy to understand from these remarks why St. Paul commends *interpretation*, i.e., a *mediate* inspiration, or the explanation of another's inspiration. The same secondary idea is sometimes contained in the verb נָבֵא, which occurs in the sense to *utter* or *announce* a divine inspiration. Hence it stands with the accusative of what is announced in Jer. xiv. 14; xxiii. 32, נָבֵא שֶׁקֶר to *utter lies*. But here נָבֵא may also denote *inspiration, to be inspired*, as it were, *with lies*. This holds good with נָבֵא בִשְׁקֶר, to be inspired with a lie (Jer. v. 31; xxix. 9). But the state of being inspired is usually designated by the *Hithpâel* form. Both words, the verb and noun, when they mean the *utterance* of a revelation, may also convey the notion of such utterance not only by intelligible speech, but poetic inspiration or song. Accordingly נָבֵא means *to sing* or *praise*; as in the triumphal ode of Miriam (Ex. xv.); whence she is termed נְבִיאָה *songstress*, not *propheteess*. Deborah is similarly spoken of (Judg. iv. 4). The same remark applies to the pupils of Samuel (1 Sam. x. 5, etc.), who are styled נְבִיאִים, though there is no trace of a prophetic state in them. The fact of their song is the only thing noticeable. The Latin *vates*, including both prophet and poet, shews the same usage.

In the Greek and Latin appellations, the second aspect of the prophets, to which we have been referring, is the only one marked, viz., the announcement of what is communicated. The word προφήτης expresses this; one that *speaks forth* or *utters* (*proloqui* not *praedicere*), the πρό being *local*, not *temporal*. So too ὑποφήτης, an announcer of (*a deo suggesta*), ἐξηγητής, θεοπρόπος, θεοπρόπιον. The abstract is φάτις and λόγιον. In Latin it is the well-known *vates*, signifying nothing but *speaker*; which is related to *vas*, *vadis* (he who speaks for one), and *vox*. The verb *vagire*, expressing children's cries, is of the same origin. Both are roots from the Sanskrit *vād* and *vāch*. The abstract Latin is *fatum*, equivalent to the Greek φάτις, prophetically expressed *fate*. Thus the divine revelation is every where designated as something uttered. In the Greek and Latin words nothing but the utterance is expressed; what is suggested or inspired being presupposed. In the Old Testament the *inner suggestions* are expressed by the word; the utterance of them being implied as a

matter of course. Prophecy is there denoted in its *interior* or *religious* side.

A second appellation of prophet is **רֹאֶה** *seer*; as is stated in an antiquarian notice appended to **חֹזֶה** in 1 Sam. ix. 9. **רֹאֶה** often appears in the Chronicles and books of Samuel; but always in relation to Samuel, except once of another prophet (2 Chron. xvi. 7-10).

The term **חֹזֶה** also means seer, and is synonymous with **רֹאֶה**. It is first applied to Gad (2 Sam. xxiv. 11). Elsewhere it appears only in Chronicles. What he shews forth is **חֲזוֹן** *vision* (Is. xxi. 2; xxix. 11). Both are applied to historical prophecy; although the reference is not to visions, but to the word spoken or written. Thus the verb **חָזַה** is used solely of prophetic words in Is. ii. 1; xiii. 1; Hab. i. 1. The name points out the revelation as an intuition given by God; and presupposes an inner eye which views things hidden from the natural one. The prophetic inspiration is regarded as a heightened spiritual power of seeing in connection with the future or the concealed present. A number of expressions designating prophecy from this point of view might here be quoted. *To open the ear or the eye* is put for the reception of the revelation. The eyes are opened for *the visions*, the ears for *the word*, of God. Hence Balaam is described as he whose eyes are opened, who hears the words of God; who possesses the knowledge, sees the vision of, the Almighty. By open eyes we understand the spiritual ones. The closed are the bodily. This mode of designating prophecy as compared with **נְבִיאָה** is *psychological*. The latter is a *religious* appellation, referring mainly to the spiritual condition of the prophet.

Here too belongs the expression **מִשְׁגֵּעַ** *raving, mad*, which relates to the external appearances produced by the rapt state. It appears in the Old Testament, however, merely as a term of contempt (2 Kings ix. 11; Jer. xxix. 26) equivalent to the Greek *μᾶντις*.

A third phrasology is derived from the destination or calling of the prophets, ex. gr. *man of God* (1 Sam. ii. 27; ix. 6, etc.; 1 Kings xiii.) *messenger of Jehovah* **מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה** (Hag. i. 13). The latter is also used of angels; and sometimes it is matter of doubt whether *they* or merely human messengers are intended. *Servant of God* is also an appellation (Is. xlv. 26). He is styled so in another than the ordinary sense, equivalent to one holding an office from God. Prophets are also *counsellors*, men who give **עֲצָה**; inasmuch as they are consulted for God's will, which they receive from Him (Is. xlv. 26; xli. 28). *Men of*

the Spirit is another phrase applied to them (Hosea ix. 7). The terms צִפְּהָ, מִצְפֵּה, שֹׁמֵר, *watchman, keeper* are also employed as poetical epithets.

IV. PSYCHOLOGICAL METHOD AND DEVELOPMENT OF HEBREW PROPHECY.—The question now arises, to what stage of inspiration Hebrew prophecy belongs? In the different times which the history of the Old Testament embraces examples of all kinds and degrees are found, from the lowest upward. But in the period from which our historical memorials of prophetic agency proceed, and which are a proper type of Hebrew prophecy, we find it developed to the highest stage of which it is capable. It is controlled by intelligent consciousness, and translated into clear notions of the understanding. It pours itself forth in a stream of connected discourse; and becomes *the word of God* to humanity. An important definition appears in the Old Testament itself (Num. xxiii. 23), where Balaam says of Israel, "There is no enchantment in Jacob, nor divination in Israel," i.e., no heathen soothsaying, "but it shall be said in their time to them, what God will do." This is the right definition of Hebrew prophecy contrasted with the symbolical prognostication of the heathen. The inspiration was effected by clear, internal illumination. Sometimes it is true it was conveyed in visions and images; but these were translated into words by the prophets themselves. This is the view commonly maintained by the fathers, after the Montanist disputes. Epiphanius, Jerome, and Chrysostom expressly announce it. The first says, "the prophet spoke with steadiness of thought and sequence, and uttered what he said by the impulse of the Holy Spirit, enunciating all strongly."¹

Jerome writes, "The prophets did not speak in ecstasy, as Montanus with his insane women dreams, so that they did not know what they said, and were ignorant of their own meaning when instructing others."²

Chrysostom states, "It is peculiar to the *mantis* to be ecstatic, to submit to necessity, to be pushed, dragged, drawn, like a madman. Not so with the *prophet*, who speaks all with a sober mind and composure, knowing what he utters."³

¹ 'Ο προφήτης μετὰ καταστάσεως λογισμῶν καὶ παρακολουθήσεως ἐλάλει, καὶ ἐφθέγγετο ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, τὰ πάντα ἐρρωμένως λέγων. Advers. Haeres. xlviii. cap. 3.

² Neque vero ut Montanus cum insanis foeminis somniat, prophetae in ecstasi sunt loquuti, ut nescirent quid loquerentur, et quum alios erudirent, ipsi ignorarent quid dicerebant. Prologus in Isaiam.

³ Τοῦτο γὰρ μάντις ἴδιον τὸ ἐξεστηκέναι, τὸ ἀνάγκην ὑπομένειν, τὸ ὠθεῖσθαι, τὸ ἔλκεσθαι, τὸ σύρεσθαι, ὥσπερ μαινόμενον. 'Ο δὲ προφήτης οὐχ ὕπνω, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας ἡφούσης καὶ σωφρονούσης καταστάσεως καὶ εἰδῶς ἃ φθέγγεται, φησὶν ἅπαντα. Homil. xix. in ep. i, ad Corinth.

The same view has also prevailed among Christian theologians of a later day. But a different theory has been promulgated in modern times, that puts Hebrew prophecy to another stage. The cause of it is to be found in apologetic considerations. It has arisen from a desire to bring the supernatural character and origin of prophetic declarations into union with their objective relative imperfection. As prophecies sometimes disagree with reality, this view has been upheld for the purpose of reconciling the two—of saving the divine origin and infallibility of the contents of the inspiration received, along with their formal imperfection ; and so excusing their occasional want of objective truth and disagreement with history. The divinity and certainty of the materials communicated is thus made consistent with formal imperfections.¹ A distinction is laid down between the subject-matter, and the way in which the prophet apprehended it. The latter is compared to imperfect glass breaking up the rays of light. This view is advocated by Velthusen.² Maimonides³ and John Smith⁴ had already propounded similar theories. Jahn⁵ and Hengstenberg⁶ followed them, the latter entering at great length into the subject in the first edition of his *Christology*. But in the second edition he has modified his sentiments to some extent. According to the hypothesis in question the prophetic state of inspiration is an *ecstasy* ; the person's own life and consciousness being suppressed by the divine. The prophecy is said to have been given in the form of vision, *i.e.*, *pure intuition*. Things of the future were presented to them as in a picture ; being placed beside one another as if present ; though in reality they were successive. Hence chronological marks were not given. Indeed the relations of time were often interchanged, the distant future being described as present *because seen as such*. In this way it can be said that the prophecy of Tyre's fall under Nebuchadnezzar, which Isaiah leads us to think would be the entire desolation of the city, is cleared of its difficulty by assuming that remote results and immediate consequences were joined together ; or that a panoramic picture of Tyre's downfall from the beginning of the destroying process till its end, passed before the prophet's mind as a connected image or series of images (Is. xxiii.). It can also be said by Hengstenberg, that because the Messiah's birth is seen by Isaiah as

¹ See Hofmann's *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, erste Hälfte, p. 9.

² *De optica rerum futurarum descriptione*, in Velthusen, Kuinoel, and Rupert's *Commentatt. Theolog.*, vol. vi. p. 75, et seqq.

³ Moreh Nevochim, *Doctor perplexorum*, in ling. Lat. conversus a J. Buxtorf, p. 292, et seqq.

⁴ *Select discourses*, 8vo.

⁵ *Einleitung in die göttlichen Bücher des alten Bundes*, vol. ii., p. 368, et seqq.

⁶ *Christology of the Old Testament translated*, vol. iv., p. 365-444.

actually present, in connexion with the proximate deliverance of which it was the sign, and irrespectively of chronological relations, the prophet makes it the measure of that deliverance (Is. vii. 14). The prophets themselves, it is said, were frequently ignorant of what they uttered, or misunderstood it. The theory in question is based upon certain formulæ and expressions of prophetic inspiration, which are borrowed, it is true, from the original stage of prophecy, but do not suit the one under consideration. Taken from the description of one grade to which alone they strictly apply, it should not be assumed that they are a true type of ordinary Hebrew prophecy. We speak of the "sun rising and setting" in the same manner, though the language is strictly inappropriate in the present state of our knowledge; applying a phraseology borrowed from a lower stage of physical science to a much higher one. Hence such expressions as "the hand of Jehovah," or "the Spirit of Jehovah" came and fell upon the prophets (Ezek. i. 3; 2 Kings iii. 15; 2 Chron. xv. 1) do not indicate "the entire subjection" of Ezekiel, Elisha, and Azariah to the divine afflatus, as Hengstenberg asserts. Neither do Jeremiah's words, "O Lord, thou hast constrained me and I was constrained; thou art stronger than I and hast prevailed . . . I said I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name. But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing and could not" (xx. 7-9) imply that he was borne out of himself, away from the sphere of mortal contemplations; or that he was in the state of *ecstasy*. Saul's messengers were probably so, as related in 1 Sam. xix. 20, etc. The entire representation, as given by Hengstenberg in particular, is highly artificial and unpsychological. It is cast in the mould of a clumsy theory of inspiration which those who arrogate to themselves the name of orthodox ignorantly advocate. While meant to uphold the supernatural origin of the prophetic material, it does so at the expense of the prophets themselves, who are converted into unconscious, mechanical, and erring organs of that material. It also does violence to the very nature of prophecy which, contrary to its character, is reduced to another type and changed into a rude, poor form wholly insufficient for its purpose. The scope of prophecy is sacrificed for the purpose of holding fast the *specifically supernatural*, without being obliged to recognise the human and natural element.¹ Ancient expositors are free from this error. But the moderns, acknowledging the occasional opposition of prophecy to what actually took

¹ See Stähelin's *specielle Einleitung*, p. 186 et seqq.

place, seek for appliances that deteriorate it systematically for the sake of preserving the divine.

Since Hengstenberg, Tholuck has also advocated the ecstatic state of the prophets as their characteristic one. In doing so, he has attempted to shew, that the fathers generally held this view even after the Montanist controversy. It is not always easy to make the fathers speak consistently with themselves and one another. But surely the esteemed writer errs in representing the polemic fathers as combating a false *ἐκστασις*—an *ἀκούσιος μανία ψυχῆς*—and as holding a view of ecstasy in which consciousness was not wholly lost. The modification thus introduced into the ecstatic view of prophecy is ingenious; but it is largely a matter of words, depending on the *precise idea* attached to the principal term. By introducing a *degree of self-consciousness* into ecstasy, the view is altered. Tholuck argues that the *productive* activity of the soul is kept in abeyance, not the *receptive*; and that the condition is *relatively* passive. The question, as it appears to us, between the view proposed by Tholuck and our own resolves itself into one of degree and terminology—the degree of consciousness in the ecstatic state. We believe, that *ecstasy*, properly so called, excludes *self-consciousness* or *intelligent consciousness*. The mistake which the esteemed critic falls into seems to be the confounding of certain *peculiar moments* of the mental condition in which the prophets had visions and waking dreams, with the usual phase of that condition. In bringing all together into one category he is obliged to allow of some intelligent consciousness. We prefer to separate between certain rapt states of their subjectivity and the ordinary ones in which they translated into clearness the *intuitions* or *visions* of the former. We would not speak, as he does, of *lower* and *higher* degrees of *ecstasy*—the one in which a connexion with the external world is continued by reflection; the other, having an expression humanly intelligible *during* them and *after* them—a capacity of thinking upon what is received in the revelation, as well as a reminiscence of it. As far as we understand the meaning of *ecstasy*, self-activity and self-consciousness are lost in it.¹

In what state of mind the prophets were when they had *visions*, it is not easy to describe. The question is a psychological one; and perhaps philosophy has not advanced far enough to throw much light on it. It appears to us that the key to a solution may be found in the doctrine of a preconscious region in the soul, which the younger Fichte has first investigated. The prophets were in a dream-waking state when they

¹ Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen, § 7, p. 49, et seqq.

had visions. Certain objective relations of their inner life came into play which remained altogether unperceived in the waking state. The preconscious region in the soul penetrated into its conscious life, giving rise to dream-pictures or ideal revelations, which fully overpowered the conscious freedom of the mind. Here the fancy had full play. There are both an inner objective truth and the pictorial mode of representing it. The latter contains nothing objectively real; the former alone has matter and meaning. These pictures are truth-revealing in an *objective* sense, because they have a material taken from the province of *ideas*. They contain the kernel of the vision—all its significance and value; while the pictorial costume is only the offspring of fancy to set it forth. It has been debated whether the prophets had *proper visions* or whether they *adopted them consciously* as vehicles of ideas. In the latter case nothing intruded into them out of the soul's preconscious region. They were mere *machinery*, i.e., means of setting forth certain perceptions. This is the reason why some of the later bear an artificial stamp. In comparison with the genuine visions of the older prophets they mark the decay of prophetism. The earlier prophets generally, and perhaps some of the later, had *proper visions*. These when translated into clear and intelligible language, present a high form of prophecy. So far as they have a real and deep meaning, they occupy an elevated place in the revelations of God to the soul; but so far as they are the mere offspring of imagination they are too near the region of the understanding to be regarded as pure prophetism. It is difficult, however, to distinguish the two kinds of what are called visions. Even visions proper can hardly have been made to the prophets in ecstasy or trance; though vision may be loosely described as an ecstatic state.* A deep truth was presented to the inner eye in vivid colours. Divine things can only be set forth *ideally*. The envelope is sensuous imagery which should always be separated from the essential truth.

There are no visions in Hosea, Nahum, and Zephaniah. Ezekiel has many descriptive of the divine majesty and the course of providence in the future. Those in Zechariah are artificial. Isaiah has but one vision, of a most sublime character (vi). Those of Micaiah (1 Kings xxii. 19) and Amos (ix. 1) are similar.¹

Prophetic illumination is described in all ancient records, both in the Bible and out of it, as a higher, a divine power, which lays hold of men. It consists in the fact of the Spirit's turning in as it were to a man, casting the human spirit out of its abode,

¹ See Bleek's *Einleitung*, pp. 422, 423.

and putting itself in place of it. In the Old Testament particularly, the essence of the true prophet lies in the fact that he uttered only what God put into his mouth, or what he heard from Him; and that he did not speak out of his own heart (Numb. xxiv. 13; xvi. 28; Ezek. xiii. 2-17; 1 Peter i. 10, etc.; John xvi. 13, etc.; Deut. xviii. 18). The question has been asked, Is this Spirit of God to which the inspiration is ascribed, to be conceived of as distinct from man's spirit, so that the inspiration should be ascribed wholly to it, without any coöperation or assistance? Is the inspiration a speaking into the soul from without, which is only received mechanically by the human spirit and given back again? Is prophetic illumination a supernatural condition—one produced by a spirit sent from God—in which the natural order of things is broken through, as it were, by a stroke? Such is the Jewish view. It is contradicted, however, by the state of the Old Testament prophecies, especially as written, which bear the irresistible impress of their people and time as well as the personality of the speaker; in other words *the coöperation of his own spirit*. The view in question rests on the hypothesis that man in his ordinary state must be wholly destitute of capacity for divine things; and that all the divine can come into him from without by some other potentiality than he has in himself. The opinion is wholly unbiblical. It is true that Scripture and all antiquity regard higher knowledge of every kind as God's gift; but they do not on that account look upon men as the blind instruments of Deity, having no will of their own, without power, and without any spiritual talent in particular. On the contrary, man has still the divine image and the Spirit of God, according to the Old and New Testaments (Gen. ix. 6; Ps. viii., li. 13, 14; Rom. i. 19, etc.; ii. 14, etc.). Without this spirit within he would be wholly unfit for the operation of the Divine Spirit. It is *this spirit* in man which is active in prophetic inspiration, because it alone is the organ of divine and heavenly things; being specifically different from *the understanding*, the organ of moral things. Of the latter the understanding knows nothing, nor would it have a premonition of aught in the department of the moral had not that spark of God's Spirit been implanted in man which is a voice to him from the higher world (1 Cor. ii. 9, etc.), not only making him acquainted with divine things, but bringing them also to his remembrance. These ideas of *reason*,—for the spirit or higher organ in man is nothing but *pure reason*—are not found out by man himself through subtle investigation. They are revealed to him. And there is none whom the voice has utterly forsaken. Thus we have two organs, one for higher and heavenly things; one for earthly.

The older Christian theology entirely overlooked this distinction between *ψυχή* and *πνεῦμα*, by ascribing to human nature nothing but a propensity for earthly things, and referring all divine predicates attributed to man in virtue of his constitution (Ps. viii. ; Rom. i. 19 ; ii. 14 ; Acts xiv. 27, etc. ; Rom. vii. 22) either to the understanding before the fall, contrary to the express language and spirit of Scripture, or to his state restored by redemption. By this means prophecy, and all manifestations of the spiritual life, are regarded as something supernatural. They are looked upon as endowments originating in a particular divine operation and efficacy, which are only found within the circle of divine revelation, and are consequently attached to the dispensation of grace. The cause of the error lies in the old conception of the fall as being a total abstraction of every divine element from human nature ; and in the contrast drawn in the New Testament between *nature* or *the natural man*, and *spirit* or *the spiritual man*. The fall of man is not an alteration of his *nature* but of *his inclination* ; a turning away from God and His will. The *natural man* in Paul's language means a disposition toward the earthly and external, which is averse to God ; and which certainly incapacitates him for divine things as well as for bringing forth fruit well-pleasing to the Most High. But this does not arise from *innate inability* of his nature, so that he *could not do if he would*, but from a *perversion of will* and of the direction indicated by his higher nature. *Nature* and *the natural man* are the names of this tendency, because it arises out of one side of human nature, and that the most visible and predominant ; we mean *sensuousness*, which is the prevailing aspect presented by men in the world. Accordingly *flesh* and *the carnal man* are synonymous expressions, which are commonly admitted to denote a *tendency*, not a *condition*, of our nature. The notion of *the natural man* is conceived in the abstract, in its entire stringency, only to shew the nature of the law. But in actual life, this condition is no more than relative, because *absolutely natural men*, i.e., such as are devoid of all spiritual endowment, do not exist. Should it be asked then, whether prophetic inspiration be a natural gift or capability, the question depends on what is meant by *nature* and *the natural man*. If human nature be considered in its entire compass, including the divine spirit implanted in it, prophecy must be called a natural endowment, inasmuch as it is a manifestation of this higher power of nature. But when the latter is considered in its divine origin and essence, reaching above nature and climbing into the higher world, prophetic inspiration must be termed a supernatural gift. The ecclesiastical view has been the latter, and it is so far true. In favour of it is the fact that the human spirit is strengthened

in living communion with God. But there are many gradations in this communion with God. The more intimate it is, the more active will be the operation of God in question. Only a small number of so called believers belong to this communion, among whom are the prophets. Men who rose higher than the truly pious of their day by the head and shoulders, and were therefore counted worthy of a higher fellowship and richer outpouring of the Spirit qualifying them for a clearer announcement of his word to mankind—such were the Old Testament prophets. In this mutual operation, *what* and *how much* proceeds from man, and what is wrought by God, is wholly indeterminate, as belonging to the mysteries of divine government.

V. THE RELIGIOUS NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF HEBREW PROPHECY WITH ITS ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE FROM THE PROPHETS AND ORACLES OF HEATHENISM.—In addition to worship, all religions have particular arrangements and institutions for guiding the divine life. These institutions are administered either by a priesthood or other intermediate persons. Both in heathenism and the Old Testament intermediate persons consult God in things pertaining to the life. These mediators may be compared to Hebrew prophecy, which is one such intermediate instrument between heaven and earth. But when we compare a little more closely the mediators of heathenism with the prophets, an essential difference is observable between them. The first kind of prophecy, the artificial (*τεχνική*), which was the only one among the Romans, consisting in an explanation of the phenomena of nature to the people, does not appear at all in the Old Testament, but is forbidden as equivalent to idolatry (comp. Ex. xxii. 18; Lev. xix. 31; xx. 6, 27; Deut. xviii. 9-14). In the last passage the various kinds of soothsaying are enumerated. The reason why they are all forbidden is because the asking of such things is an abomination to God. He had driven the Canaanites out of the land on that account. In Leviticus, it is considered a defilement of the land, like harlots, illicit intercourse, etc. It is regarded as an *apostasy from God* to false deities, and is so brought into connection with the sanctity of the Jewish people, *i.e.*, with their separation from all nations, that they might be dedicated to God alone. Over against this *false* prophecy the true is set forth. God declares that he should raise up a prophet like unto Moses from among *the people themselves*, probably in opposition to foreign nations, in whose mouth he should put His word. Him the people are to hear as God. But if he presume to proclaim God's word not as coming from above but out of his own heart, he must die. "But the prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall

“speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die” (Deut. xviii. 20). It is announced as the sign of false prophecy that the thing spoken should not come to pass: “And if thou say in thine heart how shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken: when a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously” (Deut. xviii. 21, 22).

In the Old Testament the use of external means is forbidden as irreconcilable with true faith in God, and connected with the divine judgments on heathenism, because it rests on nature-worship, a thing peculiar to Paganism, and on the superstition which puts faith in higher powers external to God and in juxtaposition with Him—powers which man seeks to make subservient to himself. The Greeks call this superstition, *δεισιδαιμονία*. The only external things among the Jews which can be classed among these outward means is, the *Urim* and *Thummim* in the breastplate of the high priest, the ephod, and the sacred lot. But it should be remembered that in the case of these it is *Jehovah* who is consulted and gives the decision. Hence they are not idolatry or superstition. In Num. xxiii., xxiv. we see both kinds of prophecy, the true and the false, characterising Judaism and Paganism respectively, united in Balaam. On the first two occasions (chap. xxiii.) he goes aside to a particular place to try whether God would meet him. *Jehovah* meets him there and puts a word into his mouth which he announces (xxiii. 3, etc.; 15, etc.). It is clear from the twenty-fourth chapter (first verse) how this meeting of God is to be understood: “He went not as at other times, to seek for enchantments,” etc. According to such language, *ire ad captanda auguria* is equivalent to *seek for enchantments*; and *meeting God* is *meeting with signs in nature*. Such conduct, according to the narrative, he did not continue farther, because he observed that *Jehovah*’s pleasure was to bless Israel. Hence he sets his face towards Israel, and the Spirit of God comes upon him (ver. 2). Before, however, he announces the oracle, he calls himself “the man who heard the words of God, who saw the vision of the Almighty, he that falls to the ground but having his eyes open” (*i.e.* the inner eyes). See verses 3, 4. Then he begins once more, and utters an oracle with his full heart and inclination, advertising Balak what this people should do to his people thereafter. And now the last response follows, which relates not merely to the prosperous fortune of the Israelites in general, but to a far distant time, and to their successes against neighbouring peoples. Here the prophecy reached its height. This oracle of Balaam represents one stage

of Old Testament prophecy. He is gradually elevated from the position of a heathen seer to that of an Old Testament prophet, for the purpose of uttering a full prediction respecting the Israelite people. We find also in Baláam a memorable saying (xxiii. 23): "Surely there is no enchantment in Jacob, neither is there any divination in Israel: At the time it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel, What God will work;" *i.e.*, it will be said at the proper time what God will do. These latter words are a designation of Old Testament prophecy. They contain an authentic declaration of God respecting His purpose. He says, *in words, at the right time*, what He will *do*. Such is the first kind of prophecy,—one which has no point of comparison in heathenism.

The other kind alone remains to be compared with heathenism—*viz.*, inspiration in dreams and visions, or in a waking state *by word*. The counterpart to it is the heathen oracle. On this subject many comparisons are found in the writings of the fathers. A well-known passage of Clement is quoted by Stäudlin. This father of the church places the distinction between heathen and Jewish prophecy in the fact that the heathen seers were inspired by demons, or excited by the influence of water or of frankincense; by narcotic powers of nature, such as waterfalls, vapours, draughts of air; while, on the contrary, the Hebrew prophets foretold events by the power and inspiration of God.¹ Thus the difference is found in the respective sources. But most of the fathers look for the ground of distinction in the psychological mode of inspiration. They suppose that prophecy among the heathen was a blind ecstasy; while Old Testament prophecy was accompanied with clear and intelligent consciousness. Hengstenberg, however, asserts the reverse in his Christology. According to him, prophecy is a *thing* of ecstasy—the difference consisting in this, that heathen prophecy is a stirring up of the lower powers against the higher, a tumult of momentary madness; while Old Testament prophecy is effected by unfettering the highest powers of the soul, and giving scope to its sublimest life; in which case the lower capacities recede into the background. Thus there is an *ecstasy* caused by divine afflatus.

This hypothesis is more correct than that of Jahn, who says that the difference lies in the nature, contents, and end of biblical prophecies. According to him, the oracles and predictions of the heathen are nothing but isolated utterances, which not only have no connection with one another, but are often contradictory, as proceeding from different gods. On the contrary,

¹ Stromata, Lib. i., 400. Comp. Kaye's account of the writings and opinions of Clement of Alexandria, p. 404, ed. 1836.

the Biblical prophecies are a connected collection.¹ Again, the heathen oracles have no other end than to help persons or states out of embarrassment regarding the future, or to satisfy curiosity, or to manage the people. But the Biblical relate to the secrets of God, serve to confirm the divine mission of the prophets, and so to place the certainty of their doctrine beyond all doubt, as well as to prove that the God who sent them is the only true God who knows the future (comp. Is. xxix. 15, 16; xl. 11-15, etc., etc.) The heathen oracles only relate to the immediate future, when the causes of the predicted event were already operative. But the Biblical prophecies occasionally refer to very remote occurrences, which lay wholly beyond the horizon of human vision. In like manner, their obscurity is not so great as that of the heathen prophecies; nor are they ambiguous but definite. Here Jahn compares the views of the prophets to perspective paintings, with a foreground definite and plain, a background encroaching on the foreground, and objects between becoming more and more indistinct till all is lost in shadow. There are various defects in this comparison, such as that the Hebrew prophets predicted future events *in definite terms*, etc., etc.² The true difference lies in the *cause* and *mode* of the inspiration. In visions and dreams there are *intuitions*. The pre-conscious region of the soul contributes to them, as has been already explained. And though the state may be called in a measure *ecstatic*, all self-consciousness is not lost, neither is the connection with the external world wholly dis severed. If it were, the images received could hardly be reproduced and translated into the expressions of intelligent consciousness afterwards. Visions, however, were not *characteristic* of prophecy. Hence, even on Hengstenberg's hypothesis, ecstasy is not a constant criterion of it. Although, therefore, visions have their counterpart in heathenism, they are a contrast to the phenomena belonging to it, as far as their *real nature* is concerned. Whatever analogy of manifestation the two present, they are decidedly and intrinsically unlike. Nothing out of the soul's pre-conscious region intrudes into the phenomena of the heathen divination-state. Fancy plays its part there; the spirit being unusually excited by causes in nature. Feeling has greater scope and power, because it is more active in the ordinary state characteristic of heathen prophets. The spirit is not brought into closer relation to the Deity, as in Old Testament visions.

Heathen prophecies and oracles are mere soothsaying; *i.e.*, means of prying into the future for external, political, and material ends, without any higher idea or universal and moral

¹ Enleitung, zweyter Theil, p. 339.

² Ibid, pp. 341, et seqq.

aims, because they were either in the service of particular corporations and communities or of individuals. In earlier times they contained fatherly counsels and admonitions. Traditions given by ancient men in prior ages were embodied in them. But in a degenerate age they gradually became mere jugglery, to deceive the people, and satisfy curiosity or self-interest. They were therefore a play of skill and cunning. The chief ingredient in them was the love of gain.

The principal work on the subject of the ancient oracles is that of Van Dale, "*De Oraculis Ethnicorum Dissertationes Duæ*," published at Amsterdam in 1683, 12mo., which was entirely directed against the erroneous theory maintained by the fathers—viz., that *demons* were the inspirers of heathen oracles.¹ But, though successful enough in its function of destruction, as an affirmative or reconstructive work the treatise of Van Dale is most unsatisfactory. De Quincey justly remarks that Fontenelle's "*History of Oracles, and the Cheats of the Pagan Priests, etc.*," 1688, London, 8vo., is based upon it, adding nothing of value.

On the other hand, the Hebrew prophets were public orators, to proclaim and enforce divine truths and laws. They were representatives of the theocratic constitution and its fundamental principles; defenders of God's cause against the passions and errors of the time—against kings, nobles, priests, and people. The distinction between the Biblical and heathen prophet has its deep ground in the difference of the respective religions; of polytheism and pantheism on the one hand, and monotheism on the other. The former have no proper dogmas, but mere forms of worship, symbols, and myths. And the reason of that characteristic arises from the fact of the Deity not being conceived of as an eternal Being but originating in time; whether, as in the Oriental pantheism, he does not attain to consciousness till a certain stage in the gradual development of the world, or that deities are born from one another in time. Hence we find in it nothing more than a history of the manifold evolutions and developments of the divine essence, which do not take place according to moral ideas and laws, though they are not wholly unfettered, but subject to *fate*, which is blind, having only a dark impulse of right mixed with caprice. Here the intercourse with men is an immoral thing: the gods visit the daughters of men. All that is contained in heathenism is only mythology and symbol—i.e., a traditional form of divine worship. It is true that conscience has not entirely left itself without a witness even there. Hence the felt want of unity,

¹ See Wachsmuth's *Hellen. Altherthumskunde*, vol. II., p. 164, et seqq.

right, order, which sought for something satisfying amid the confusion, by saving itself in the obscure idea of *fate*. Yet there is no clear consciousness in that solution. The heathen also regarded their gods as the avengers of wrong and rewarders of right.

A clearer consciousness expressed in moral conceptions and in truths of a moral nature is found in the poets and philosophers of antiquity, who are the first that can be compared with the prophets of the Old Testament. Ottfried Müller has referred to a deity among the Greeks (he is Apollo among the Dorians), who certainly appears to present the moral principle which we miss in heathenism. In Apollo he has pointed out a god of light—a principle of right, order, and moral purity—who also appeared as the messenger of Zeus, and had nothing in common with the deities of the elementary religions.¹ This fact may be significant in relation to primitive times; but at any rate the principle was not operative either in the more ancient or later practice. This is obvious from the one question, why was it not preserved and maintained?

Monotheism brings with it nothing but religious truths, in the province of the ethical. Man ascends by faith to the apprehension of one God only, and must therefore consider Him not only as the fountain of all life, but also as the aim of every living thing—the Being who is conducting everything to one great end. Herein lies the clear conception of an end and order in the constitution of the world. The former is determined by God's holiness, in virtue of which He seeks to make all things subservient to one grand design, and to bring them into union with himself. The latter, which is moral, serves as a mean to this, since it is chosen with wisdom and controlled by omnipotence. All existing things are judged by their adaptation to effect the end the Creator has in view; and are righteously rewarded as they promote or hinder it. Thus a twofold idea lies in monotheism; the idea of a holy God, and its practical realization or in other words the sanctification of humanity, which is a necessary consequence of such Being's existence. This realization of God's end is the object of man's faith and struggles. It is the object of divine revelations, which are intended to educate man, because he is too weak to reach his own consummation. What form then did this educational course take in Hebraism? The ideas and problems of humanity appear there in a particular setting and application in consequence of the theocratic principle. In the first place, the end of God in the world, the sanctification of humanity is presented

¹ History and Antiquities of the Doric race, vol. i. p. 329.

in national limitation, or in other words as a sanctification of the Israelite people; and secondly, the means of moral order is represented as a kingdom of God on earth, a formal constitution or covenant, in which God appears as king—all laws being the expression of his will, and all visible magistrates his officers. But such limitation constantly shews itself to be preliminary. With an ever-growing tendency to universality it cannot be the *ultimate* aim but merely a means of reaching it—a method of grounding men in God's educational plan. The essence of the Messianic idea lies in this. To keep alive in the people the elevated idea and destination of the theocracy, to inculcate it when it was in danger of being forgotten, to develop it on different sides and apply it to different relations; such was the vocation of the prophets. They were therefore God's speakers to proclaim his will; defenders and guardians of the theocratic principle, each in his own manner. From this it is clear that while they were religious mediators, they were at the same time political speakers and demagogues, because in the theocratical principle, as in every religion, the religious and political are connected. So far they resembled the orators of antiquity. A great historical development of the theocratic idea pervades their discourses.

VI. RELATION OF PROPHECY TO THE MOSAIC CONSTITUTION AND LAW.—Two elements in the Mosaic constitution may be distinguished, a belief in the doctrine of the true God, His nature, will, relation to Israel, and from them outward to the rest of mankind, as well as in Israel's relation to Him, including their holy destination—in a word, belief in the kingdom of God. It also implies a connected system of prescribed actions and forms in which the relation is represented *symbolically*. This symbolic, however, is not merely an external service and sacrifice as it appears among other peoples, but embraces the entire life by virtue of the theocratic idea. One has only to think of the laws of purification to be convinced that it enters into all relations of justice and politics. Faith is the inner side of it, the two being mutually related as substance and form, spirit and letter. The spiritual and the legal are easily distinguished. They are represented by two kinds of intermediate persons wholly different from one another, *prophets* and *priests*. To the latter were entrusted the entire Mosaic legislation, the *symbolic*, the *cultus*, and also the administration of justice. They were the administrators of traditional usages and laws. For this purpose a certain degree of knowledge and skill was necessary, and therefore it was attached to a particular office with an income to live upon. It was the privilege of an especial class in which it was hereditary—the priestly class. And here, as in every other like case, the

faults of the sacerdotal condition made their appearance, viz., an excessive inclination to ceremonies, an exaggerated estimate of the external, with a neglect of the thing itself. What made the fault greater was, that the priests also strengthened the inclination of the people for the outward. On the other side stood the prophets, whose office it was to maintain the spirit of the theocracy, and to explain the sense of the symbols with spiritual freedom. As representatives of the theocracy, they had to apply it to circumstances. It was theirs to hold up to view the true sense of the laws and usages handed down. Their business was to explain the law in all its fullness. In this manner the prophets continued the work of Moses, whose representatives and successors they were. They conserved and propagated Mosaism, whose triumph they contributed to bring about in the family of Israel, notwithstanding the idolatrous tendencies of the people and the infraction of a fundamental principle of the theocracy by the establishment of monarchy. They educated the community, leading them forward towards the state for which they were intended by God. The prophets formed a counterpoise and check to the power of *the positive and formal*. They represented and fostered a principle of progress by which Mosaism was developed and spiritualised—a principle that gave birth to Christianity. Thus they did not place themselves above it, as though it ceased to be a rule demanding obedience. They unfolded its requirements and enforced its authority, by exciting a higher and more spiritual apprehension of its import. To a certain extent they anticipated its proper and full significance—viz., that obedience to God is the true sacrifice well-pleasing in His sight. In interpreting it thus, they announced the future development of the divine kingdom. The history of the Jews abundantly shows that they needed to be constantly called to a sense of its claims. Able as they were occasionally to rise above its forms, they saw that external sacrifices must eventually give place to the true sacrifice of the heart and life which Jehovah requires. But though they had glimpses of a future when the Mosaic sacrifices should cease, they did not think of altering them. Those offerings were a necessary discipline, preparing the people for what they foreshadowed. In getting beyond the form to the underlying substance, they could denounce undue reliance on such observances as outwardly efficacious; glancing forward to a period when the moral law should be inscribed on the heart as a rule of life, and the ceremonial be done away by virtue of the great offering in which Messiah should shew the moral power of self-sacrifice to God. Their ethics appeared most favourably in inculcating the sentiment that obedience is better

than sacrifice. "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God" (Micah vi. 18). So Joel addresses the people: "Rend your heart and not your garments" (ii. 13). In this ethical exposition of the law there was nothing absolutely new. The intention of the old law was simply *evolved*. A few passages which seem to imply censure of the law, do not bear that meaning when properly understood, as Hosea vi. 6; Is. i. 13-14; Jer. vii. 22. Here there is merely a strong contrast between moral requirements and outward compliance with the law of Moses. The way in which it is expressed implies a consciousness of the law's symbolical character. The law was to be transformed into an inward and spiritual rule written on the heart; and then outward sacrifices, and all such means of atonement should cease, as Jeremiah declares (xxxii. 31, etc.) The same sentiment appears in Is. lxvi. 20, and Joel iii. 1. "Thus while they refer men to a study of the law, they express also its life in fresh forms of their own. They lay stress on its external ceremonies, but they cry out for that which it expresses, even a conformity of mind, and by consequence of life, to the unwritten word which stands fast in the counsel of God."¹ In the Book of Deuteronomy, the law is similarly treated. Circumcision of the heart is inculcated. The Mosaic legislation is somewhat spiritualised.

A few exceptions to this prophetic treatment of the Mosaic law appear. But they are only exceptions in which ceremonial transgression is blamed, as in Mal. i. 13, 14, where the bringing of blemished animals is reprovèd; in Is. lxvi. 17, where the eating of swine's flesh is spoken against; and Ezek. xx. 11-13, xxii. 8, where Sabbath-breaking is censured. Here the influence of later Judaism is seen, not the inculcation of that genuine theocratic life which breathes the true spirit of the law.²

VII. CALL TO THE PROPHETIC MINISTRY.—The remarkable influence which the prophets legitimately exerted could only prevail when it was associated with a superior power of the spirit, which is neither the privilege nor possession of a definite order of men. The prophetic work must be done by men who feel themselves inwardly called to it. Hence it was not a hereditary thing. It was attached to no outward condition. No particular station or rank claimed it. Birth did not affect it. It was associated only with the full power of the Spirit's inward attestation. The office rested on the idea of having an immediate call from God, under the irresistible impulse of the

¹ Dr. R. Williams in *A Dialogue of the Knowledge of the Supreme Lord*, in which are compared the claims of Christianity and Hinduism, etc., p. 311.

² See Tholuck, *Die Propheten*, u. s. w., p. 35 et seqq.

divine Spirit, or through an inspiration; and the force of such call is often represented symbolically by the alleged striving of the men against it, their hesitation to undertake the work, and their objections. Thus there is sometimes a sort of dialogue between God and them (Is. vi. etc.). So it was also with Balaam, who strove to say evil and could not (Num. xxii.-xxiv.).

Music may have been one of the characteristic means employed by the prophets for putting themselves into a state of mind more susceptible of inspiration. Yet it is but twice mentioned. When Elisha was asked his advice on a certain occasion, he caused a minstrel to be brought; and as the latter played on his instrument, the hand of the Lord came upon the prophet. But as he belonged to the prophetic association, and we read that disciples in the prophetic schools had psaltery, harp, tabret, and pipe, while they went in procession (1 Sam. x.), the usage may have been peculiar to such schools. It is not mentioned elsewhere. We think it probable that it was only employed occasionally, and for the most part in the earlier period.

Except the inward call to the prophetic office, which was indispensable, nothing outward in the form of ceremony or inauguration seems to have been practised. The people as well as the men themselves deemed the divine impulse sufficient. Anointing may have been used on some occasions. The only circumstances that favour the idea of such unction having been practised are, that Elijah was divinely commanded to anoint his successor Elisha (1 Kings xix. 16) (a commission which may not have been executed, for the record says nothing of its being done); that in Is. lx. 1, the prophet says, "the spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord *hath anointed me*," etc.; and that the expression *Jehovah's anointed*, in Psalm cv., 15, is parallel to *prophets*. But these expressions in Isaiah and the psalm refer rather to *spiritual* anointing—the influence of the Spirit upon their souls. We infer, therefore, that the prophets were not inaugurated by unction. Nor does the imposition of hands appear to have been practised at their entrance upon office, as a sign that the Spirit of God was conveyed to them. Moses indeed put his hands upon Joshua (Deut. xxxiv. 9); but even Elijah did not so dedicate Elisha.

VIII. SIGNS AND WONDERS EMPLOYED BY THE PROPHETS. —Occasionally the prophets strengthened the faith of others in what they said by signs (אֵימָת, מוֹפֵת). These were given to prove or confirm what they promised or predicted—*tokens* or *pledges* of the fulfilment of their utterances. Hence they related to the future, and consisted either in foretelling some minor event whose fulfilment served as a proof of the future fulfilment of the entire prophecy; or in making persons symbolical

types shadowing forth to the outward senses future things, and so becoming sensible pledges of their occurrence.

1. An example of the former is the sign announced by the prophet to Eli, concerning the destruction of his house—viz., that his two sons should die in one day (1 Sam. ii. 27–34). Here it will be observed that the sign is not a wonderful or *miraculous* event, but a natural occurrence. The wonderful is in the foretelling of it. In like manner Samuel, after anointing Saul, gives him three different *signs*, to assure him that God should henceforth be with him (1 Sam. x. 2, etc.) Other examples occur in 1 Kings xiii. 1–3, Jer. xlv. 29, 30. Instances of the same kind, where the sign itself is supernatural, may be found in Is. xxxviii. 7, 22; 2 Kings xx. 3–11. In both cases the miraculousness is to be accounted for by the fact that the description is later than the things themselves, so that their original form cannot now be separated from the magnifying excrescences it subsequently received.

2. The prophets also present *themselves* as *signs*, by performing symbolical actions, and thus showing forth in their own persons what should happen afterwards (Is. xx. 3; Ezek. xii. 6, 11; xxiv. 24, 27). Or they make others *signs*, as Isaiah does his children (Is. viii. 18).

In all cases we must look upon these signs as intended to create and strengthen the belief of the people in the certainty of the prophets' announcements, which seemed the more necessary because the things proclaimed were future.

It is needless to speak of **אוֹתוֹת** *signs*, when not connected with *proper prophets*. Their signification is then more general. The two terms **אוֹת** and **מוֹפֵת** (*sign* and *wonder*) are often found together; the latter being more restricted in sense than the former, if they be used separately. They are used synonymously together.

IX. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF HEBREW PROPHECY IN ITS RELATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD.—The opposition between the two orders did not exist in heathenism, or at least was not developed. Their oracles either belong to the priests, or are managed in their interest and spirit. Strictly speaking, however, the close priesthood as a caste, with its *cultus*, was a later institution than the prophetic order or seers, who are found among the rudest nations on the low stand-point of Fetichism. The original Chamanism was subsequently drawn into and swallowed up by the priesthood. Just so in the Old Testament did the peculiar significance and activity of prophetism with its contrast to the priesthood gradually develop itself and then disappear. It was not a perfect institution at once. But it is

difficult to present a historical development of its course, because the sources of our knowledge are obscure.

At the earliest time of its manifestation, the period of the Judges and first Kings, prophecy appears only in isolated traces. Two kinds of oracles may however be distinguished, the *material* and *theocratic*. The former of these was continuously under priestly guidance; the latter appeared scatteredly, on extraordinary occasions, in particular ambassadors of God. To the first, belongs the asking of God (שאל ביהוה) chiefly in political or material affairs, as war, the choice of a king, etc. Such consultation is but indefinitely mentioned, and only at the sanctuary; yet without specifying the means, as Judg. i. 1; xx. 18, etc. Where the means are given, the asking is almost always by priests, through the Urim and Thummim, the holy ark, and the ephod.

The Urim and Thummim was an ornament on the high priest's dress. In Egypt something of the same kind was suspended from the neck of the judges. The phrase means *light* and *truth*; and the thing, whatever it was, did not consist in *sacred lots* or in *gems*. The ephod was an image or bust, made perhaps of wood covered with gold, as Michaelis supposes. Such a figure was fabricated by Gideon (Judg. viii. 24-27). The idol of Micah and the Danites is also called an ephod (Judg. xvii. 3-5; xviii. 17-20). It is not likely that Gideon would have made an image or bust to a heathen god; and therefore we must suppose it to have been an image to Jehovah, like Aaron's golden calf in the wilderness. In Mosuism, such images were strictly forbidden. The case of the Teraphim which had a human form, amounts to the same. These prophetic images, which were supposed to give responses in doubtful cases, were unsanctioned by the law, though greatly venerated in the earlier and heroic times (Judg. xvii., xviii.).

The first way, viz., of asking by Urim and Thummim, the ephod, the holy ark, to which may be added the casting of the sacred lot, occurs in the books of Samuel, and was practised under Samuel, Saul, and David. Thus the choice of Saul was made, according to Samuel's direction, by the lot (1 Sam. x. 17, etc.). The ark was employed under Saul (xiv. 18, 36, 37). David *inquired of the Lord* respecting Keilah (1 Sam. xxiii. 2, etc.); about pursuing the Amalekites, by the ephod (xxx. 7, etc.); about the choice of a royal residence (2 Sam. ii. 1, etc.); concerning war with the Philistines (2 Sam. v. 19, etc.); and respecting a famine (2 Sam. xxi. 1, etc.). In addition to these modes of inquiring at Jehovah there were also

prohibited ways of prying into the future, such as sorcery and necromancy which Saul had put away from the land (1 Sam. xxviii. 3, 9), though he was induced himself to visit the witch of Endor. The method we have noticed is *the artificial*. But there was another. On extraordinary occasions *particular men of God* appeared for the purpose of announcing punishment or making a charge against the rulers or people, in the very strain of the later prophets, and as representatives of the theocratic principle. These special messengers of Jehovah, or individual prophets, disappeared after executing their commission. The mention, however, of the *men of God* in the period of the Judges does not belong to the primary sources of the book, but rather to the *redaction*. And the redaction, as well as the existing form of the historical books, is confessedly late. Hence the cases in question are scarcely historical. Thus in Judg. ii. 1, etc., a messenger (not an angel) came from Gilgal to Bochim (Judg. vi. 7, etc.; x. 11, etc.). In the last passage Jehovah himself is introduced as speaking. The sources, irrespective of the redaction, do not contain messages of this nature. Yet even these messengers announce no general theocratic principles. They come rather to give definite commands from God, or to proclaim the issue of a thing. They are *oracles*. To this class belongs, in a measure, Deborah, who is called *a prophetess* (Judg. iv. 4), so far as she was sent with a message in the name of God. But she may also have got the name for the same reason as Miriam, Moses's sister, because of *her song* (Ex. xv. 20). Besides, *angels* came as messengers, to call forth God's heroes, or to announce their appearance (Judg. vi. 11; xiii. 3, etc.). In 1 Sam. ii. 27, a man of God was sent to Eli to tell him of the rejection of his house. There were also so-called *men of God* who were consulted in things of common life for payment, such as to find something lost (1 Sam. ix. 8). These were first styled *seers*. Such was Samuel at the beginning, being asked about the lost asses of Kish. Such too was Gad, in the time of David (2 Sam. xxiv.). So much for the period of the Judges, in which Mons. Nicolas singles out the three prophets mentioned, Judg. ii. 1-3, 20, 21; vi. 8-10; 1 Sam. ii. 27-36, as proper representatives of Mosaism and similar to the later prophets, without considering the late redaction of the books of Judges and Samuel, or the passing nature of the messages.¹

Both were united in Samuel, *the artificial oracle* and the *prophetic office*. The latter appeared as a public institute—a profession—forming an important counterpoise to priesthood and kingship. As its origin was contemporaneous with that of the

¹ Etudes critiques sur la Bible, p. 331, et seqq.

kingly office in Israel, it has been inferred that Samuel, when he saw that a king was inevitable, thought among other things of the Hebrew prophets as a check to the power and future tyranny of the kings. In opposition to this, Mons. Nicolas contends that the historical data derivable from 1 Sam. viii., ix., and x., shew schools of the prophets anterior to the establishment of monarchy.¹ But it is impossible to prove their existence before Samuel from the chapters in question. The organization of prophetism was the work of his mature age; and it was not till his old age that the establishment of monarchy appeared a necessary guarantee for order and security, which the ephemeral authority of judges had failed to be. He was loath as a parent to discover the unfitness of his sons for supreme power and their inability to succeed him; but their unworthiness was forced upon him in old age in a manner he could not resist seeing. It is probable therefore that the establishment of a prophetic order did not enter into Samuel's plan, though it subsequently proved a useful instrument of resistance to the unjustifiable measures of many kings. Rather did he intend to diffuse among the Hebrews right ideas of God's kingdom and government by establishing the ministry of the Spirit on a solid basis. The rise of the kingly power was an unforeseen incident which came to disturb his purpose, without being able to destroy it. To him at least belongs the distinguished merit of laying the true foundation of Hebrew prophecy. He felt that the law of Moses required development and modification in connection with the progress of the nation; and yet that it would be dangerous to touch the letter of it. Hence the necessity of interpreters suggested itself. He perceived that men were needed who could enter into its true meaning, and participate, as it were, in the spirit of the legislator. Mosaism had to be *spiritualised* by breathing life and motion into the dead letter. Unity was to be established in the Hebrew republic. Samuel, therefore, founded a permanent institute, a college of inspired orators.

Prophecy did not shew itself at once in Samuel's theocratic activity. It exerted indeed an important influence upon him; but only on account of his personal character. Examples of the oracle appear promiscuously, even after his day. The prophets Gad and Nathan came forth for the first time under David in a theocratic way (2 Sam. vii., xii. 1). The latter stepped forward with a severe charge of adultery and murder against David; while the former (2 Sam. xxiv. 11, etc.) blamed the king for numbering the people. In David's last days, Nathan played

¹ *Etudes critiques sur la Bible*, p. 365, et seq.

an important part in the management of Solomon's succession to the throne (1 Kings i.).

Under Solomon no prophetic activity is recorded. Yet these men could not have been idle when the monarch in his old age became the protector of idolatry, erecting altars to the deities of the women in his harem. On this occasion, when they found other means unavailing, they adopted a violent remedy. As there was a powerful faction which had existed of old against David's dynasty, and had its chief centre in the tribe of Ephraim, they turned their eyes towards it, and undertook to erect a new dynasty, which would be more amenable to their counsels, on the ruins of one that seemed to abandon Jehovah. Accordingly, under Ahijah's promptings, a man of Ephraim raised the standard of revolt after the death of Solomon, and constituted a new kingdom embracing the northern part of Palestine. How grievously the hopes of Ahijah and other prophets were disappointed, the history of Jeroboam attests. Indeed the short-sightedness of the seer fails to see that an inseparable barrier would be set up in the interest of policy between the adherents of the rival monarch and those who continued faithful to David's house—a barrier which nothing could effect better than a separate worship as different as possible, and remote from the monotheism of Jerusalem without being polytheistic. A golden calf, the symbol of Elohim, served for this purpose.¹ When these images were set up at Dan and Bethel, the prophets saw their mistake in contributing to rend the family of Jacob into two kingdoms. Immediately after Solomon's death, Ahijah was busy as a prophet, under Rehoboam, announced the division of the kingdom, and called Jeroboam to be king of the ten tribes (1 Kings xi. 29, etc.). In like manner Shemaiah appeared (1 Kings xii. 22), and persuaded Rehoboam not to make war upon Israel. In 1 Kings xiii. it is related that *a man of God* came out of Judah, and cried against the altar at Bethel. From Jeroboam's times and onward, the prophetic order were most active in Israel, because that kingdom was the scene of greater political and religious disorder. There we find a prophet named Jehu, under Baasha, Nadab's successor (1 Kings xvi.). During Ahab's reign, which was the main turning point in the historical development of prophetic activity, we find the most powerful and vehement of all, Elijah and Elisha, who were also surrounded by disciples belonging to the *schools of the prophets*. At a later time, under Jeroboam the second, Amos and Hosea raised their voices against idols and image worship. But it was not till the priesthood had been developed in Judah that pro-

¹ See Nicolas's *Etudes critiques*, p. 373, et seqq.

phesy took the definite form already described and became a counterpoise to priesthood. In this contest royalty and priesthood must succumb in the end, however long they might succeed in crushing down the voice of God in his high-minded servants. Prophetism requires two things in its higher inspiration, viz., a certain stage of spiritual culture and religious development, and a dependence upon political conditions. It needs a certain freedom and elasticity in the popular spirit. It is the blossoming of a powerful, spiritual life among the people. On the other hand, it withers, along with this popular life, under continuous despotism. Priesthood has far more power of endurance, because it is based on a mighty and general tendency in humanity, sways the mass, stifles mind, feeling, and a sound life in the people, nay, prophecy itself in the end, till another order of things arise, and true religion become the mighty power which God intended it to be in the latter days.

X. PROPHECY AND POLITICS.—In consequence of the theocratic institution, the ministry of the prophets was not merely a religious but a political one. They were the highest statesmen, recognising most clearly the importance of religious principles to give political confidence. Interfering as they did in national measures, with proper motives and for the people's true welfare, they were sound politicians. Demagogues in the best sense of the phrase, they gave utterance to ethical truths that lie at the foundation of all righteous government. Their patriotic feeling was strong, even where they advised submission to a foreign power. The charge of want of patriotism which some have advanced against Jeremiah for recommending subjection to Babylon can hardly be just, when we think of the fact that Zedekiah had received his crown from Nebuchadnezzar and taken a solemn oath of allegiance to him. The prophet who chose to remain in the desolated land with a few miserable remains of his countrymen, rather than go to the court of Babylon, does not appear unpatriotic. For him to have urged resistance to Nebuchadnezzar, in the circumstances of the country and capital, would have been the height of imprudence. Patriotism consists with prudence as well as with unflinching resistance to a foreign foe. We call it therefore compatible with patriotism in Jeremiah when he counsels his people to submit; nor can we perceive its contradiction to high-mindedness, though Mr. Newman thinks so. It is a grand picture, that of the true prophets. They were the heroes of divine truth, patriotic, pious, bold men, with a strong

¹ Hupfeld, *Die Politik der Propheten des alten Testaments*, in the *Neue Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, No. 22 for 1862.

ethical feeling of justice and right, and a glowing zeal for Jehovah's honour and service. The spiritual element of their nature was roused and intensified. It were wrong to call the afflatus under which they spoke and acted the same as the poetical one, or the impulse of real genius. It was higher than that—a *divine inspiration* mingling with and waking up their moral consciousness to an unusual degree, not mystifying but *stimulating* and *controlling* their powers. Faith and truth were their great watchword. With surpassing earnestness of mind and manner, they uttered deep truths lying beyond the horizon of their time, and even beyond that of the ordinary piety of humanity. The voice of God within bearing them onward and forward with overpowering might could not be resisted. Mankind owes them a debt of eternal gratitude. Well does Bunsen say that they were not only prophets of the people, but of humanity.¹ By their lofty example, as well as the principles they enunciated, they educated their own generation and all succeeding ones. Christianity itself embodied and perfected their principles. As heralds of the divine will, they were not, however, exempted from human frailty and national contractedness. They were men like ourselves in all the variety of personal gifts. But they had a divine mission and noble impulse, which carried them into a higher strain and sphere than prosaic mortals reach.

XI. SCHOOLS OF THE PROPHETS.—This institution, which has been compared to various later associations, seems to have been intended mainly for instruction. The historical notices of it are scanty, occurring only in connexion with Samuel, and the ministries of Elijah and Elisha. It is an improbable opinion of Keil's that after having been founded by Samuel, these schools were re-established by Elijah, which would imply that they ceased in the interval between Samuel's death and the Tishbite. Rather did they continue from Samuel till Elijah in uninterrupted succession; a supposition favoured by the fact that a great number of prophets existed when the latter made his public appearance (1 Kings xviii. 13). In 1 Sam. x. 5-12 we meet with a company (חֶבֶל) of prophets (נְבִיאִים) who come down from the hill of Gibeah in Benjamin, and prophesy. It is not stated that they dwelt in Gibeah; they may have been to it on a pilgrimage, and have been seized by the way. Again, in 1 Sam. xix. 19, etc., we read of a company (לְחֶקֶה) of prophets prophesying with Samuel at their head, at Ramah, in *Natioth*, a word signifying *dwelling*s, as though they lived beside one another. In neither of these passages is there anything to

¹ Gott in der Geschichte, vol. i. p. 223.

suggest the idea of a *school* properly so called. It is *prophets*, not *the sons of the prophets* (בְּנֵי נְבִיאִים), who assembled around Samuel. The sons of the prophets are said in 2 Kings iv. 38, to *sit before their master*. In the association of the prophets at Ramah, we see a company brought together by their own free choice to prepare themselves by sacred exercises for a theocratic life. Music and song were employed, partly to attune the mind to calmness and raise it by the soft harmony of numbers to the contemplation of the divine. As has been well said, music brings a tone out of the higher world into the spirit of the hearer.¹ Literature was also attended to. The sacred records of the nation, *written* and *oral*, were read. Hence the earliest prophetic writers, as Amos and Hosea, have numerous allusions to the older history, and mention many written laws (Hos. viii. 12). Some of these historical annals were incorporated into the canonical books of Kings and Chronicles. They were the objects of diligent study on the part of these associated prophets. There is no mention of any other college of prophets in the time of Samuel, except that at Ramah. Nor can we tell, in the absence of express information, what its internal arrangements were.

The next mention of associations of prophets or *prophetic schools* properly so called, does not occur till the reign of Joram, when Elijah and Elisha were both living. Three localities are spoken of at which they were established; Bethel (2 Kings ii. 3), Jericho (ii. 5), and Gilgal (iv. 38): but the one established at Gilgal was afterwards removed for want of room to the banks of the Jordan (2 Kings vi. 1). Other passages imply that the occupants of these establishments were numerous (2 Kings ii. 16; iv. 43; vi. 1). The inmates are termed *sons of the prophets* who are said to *sit before* the master or president (1 Kings xx. 35; 2 Kings iv. 38; vi. 1). Living together, they partook of their meals in common. Some were married, others not; but it is likely that the latter had dwellings of their own round about the common centre, where the former lived in close intimacy (2 Kings iv. 1, etc.). They must not be viewed as recluses in monasteries. This is an unfortunate parallel of Jerome's. If an analogous institute out of Judaism be looked for, it is found in the Pythagorean associations. Perhaps *theological seminaries* are the nearest approach to them in the sphere of Christianity.² They do not seem to have acted much or extensively on the outward life of the people; neither was their agency directed toward the continuance or enlargement of the theocracy. Their life was more contemplative than active. The praises of Jehovah

¹ Koester, p. 254.

² See Tholuck, *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, pp. 26, 27.

were celebrated by them in pious hymns which they composed and sang.¹ It is possible indeed that they travelled in the land to excite the people to good; yet their influence was not extensive. Both their manner of life and dress were simple. The people brought them spontaneous offerings and presents on which they subsisted (1 Kings xiv. 3; 2 Kings iv. 1, 38, 42). Occasionally they suffered hunger, and went out into the fields to gather herbs. They kept cattle and tilled the ground at times. Their apparel was coarse. They wore nothing but the plain tunic or under-garment. Their principals had a mantle. Elijah wore a leathern girdle (2 Kings i. 8) besides a mantle or cloak. Since those in the northern kingdom of Israel were separated from the sanctuary at Jerusalem, it has been rightly inferred from 2 Kings iv. 23, that the pious were wont to assemble in these prophetic abodes for worship, at the new moons and sabbaths, on which occasions especially it probably happened that the offerings set apart by the law for the Levitical priests were brought. There is no proof that these *schools of the prophets* existed in the kingdom of Judah. They were not required there. The Rabbins indeed represent them as existing down to the Babylonish captivity; but the passage they refer to in 2 Kings xxii. 14, where מִשְׁנֵה is the house of Huldah the prophetess, hardly supports the view. The word does not mean a *college* or *place of instruction*, but the second quarter of the city. It is quite probable that the prominent prophets in Judah had small circles of friends and disciples about them, who wished to keep alive the divine word in the midst of apostacy; but these were not *organisations* or *schools of the prophets*.²

Schools of the prophets do not furnish a proper example of Hebrew prophetism, because young men *trained* and *prepared themselves* in them for promoting religious culture generally. True prophetic inspiration does not come in that way. It does not consist with *reflection*. The exercise of the understanding, so far from conducing to its existence, has an opposite tendency. An educational process unfits the soul for the genuine, divine afflatus.

XII. PRINCIPLES CONSTITUTING THE GROUND-WORK OF THE PROPHETIC MINISTRY.—The prophets were not *teachers*, properly speaking, but *speakers*. They saw *images*, not *abstract thoughts*. Hence they did not inculcate *doctrine*. They wished to call forth fixedness of purpose and steadiness in its execution, by admonition, warning, and threatening. The *universal principle* which constitutes the sum of their discourses is a decided belief in one God as the Almighty, holy, and righteous Ruler

¹ Stähelin's *Specielle Einleitung*, u. s. w. p. 189.

² See Oehler, *Prophetenthum des A. T.* in Herzog's *Encyklopaedia*.

of the world, the rightful Lord and King of the Jewish people; who chose them to be a peculiar people, a nation of priests holy unto Himself; and willed *that they should be holy*. Accordingly He required of his people both *sanctification* and unconditional *confidence* in His protection. In conformity with the same principle, the prophets censured idolatry as a breach of faith against the only true God and apostacy from their lawful Governor. This treason was not always in word. It lay in deed also. It was of two kinds, *secret unbelief* in God's protecting power, which was not always expressed, but manifested itself *practically* by grasping at all kinds of carnal means, such as warlike defences, alliances, etc.; and *superstition*, i.e. pretended or *false* faith. It was so with the false prophets, who had recourse to sorceries. On the contrary, the true inculcated trust in God, warning the people against an outward worship and empty sacrifices. They reprovcd current vices among men of distinction; and pointed to God the helper of widows and orphans, who does not leave unpunished the man that oppresses them. In like manner, they combated extortion and the oppression of the poor, partiality in judgment, luxury, and haughtiness which is unseemly to man in the sight of God. By way of supporting and strengthening their admonitions, they had promises for the compliant and penitent, forgiveness of sin, help in distress, deliverance from oppression, and restoration of prosperity as well as of the kingdom of God. On the other hand, they had threatenings and divine chastisements for the unbelieving, which usually consisted in the invasions of foreign peoples bringing desolation on the land, and in captivity or death. It is for this reason that the prophetic discourses are predominantly connected with the form of *prediction*. The predictive aspect of them, however, has been too exclusively attended to till recently.

XIII. PROPHECY AND PREDICTION.—Prophecies in the true sense of that term are not to be taken as *predictions*. They are not the announcement of future events for satisfying curiosity. God himself must be regarded as their end, idea, and motive. Their leading idea is that of the *divine righteousness*, so far as God appears sovereign of the theocratic kingdom; and that idea is only applied to the case in question in the firm conviction that it must be carried into effect. Hence two peculiarities may be explained, viz., that the idea is *conditioned by historical relations*; and therefore prophesyings do not lose themselves in air, without substance; and also, that they are for the most part *indefinite* and *general*, consisting of general images of prosperity and adversity. Such images often appear very vague. They should not be taken literally. In the case of

those borrowed from nature, it should be considered that they form a corresponding parallel to the world of mankind. Wherever definite predictions having special details occur, particularly in relation to *times*, it can be shewn that they are supposititious; or that the whole prophecy is spurious, *e.g.*, the predictions respecting Cyrus in Isaiah, etc., which are unauthentic. In like manner, Daniel's predictions are spurious.

It is a sound canon, *that prediction must not disturb history*. This has been well illustrated by Nitzsch.¹ Thus the foretellings of the Sybil, describing the life of Jesus historically, are fiction. Detailed predictions cease to belong to the region of prophecy. Not every one indeed, as Tholuck properly remarks; but only such as are uttered *in presence of the acting subjects of history*. This appears from Ezek. xxi., where the prophet, who is far distant, knows that the Babylonian army was before Jerusalem on a certain day; and gives a vivid picture of the city at the time. In the twelfth chapter of the same book of Ezekiel, the fate of Zedekiah at the taking of the city is particularly described. It is incorrect to assert that the prophets occasionally gave forth definite numbers respecting the future, as Tholuck still maintains.² Jeremiah indeed is represented as predicting the seventy years' captivity (xxix. 10); but it is not so easy as this critic imagines, to make out its duration for that time; since the *terminus a quo* taken, the fourth year of Jehoiakim, is inadmissible. Even with that, but sixty-eight years can be elicited, as he allows; without sanctioning Hengstenberg's historical combinations. The number seventy is simply a round number. That number connected with Tyre in Is. xxiii. 15, is of the same character. Tholuck himself allows that it is but *approximative*; for he reckons only sixty-six years, basing that calculation too on an uncertain interpretation of the passage. *Approximative*, not *precise*, numbers vitiate the position assumed by the critic at the outset; and therefore both the seventies, with Is. vii. 16; viii. 4, are irrelevant. The fifteen years announced by Isaiah as added to Hezekiah's life would be to the point; for the number exactly agrees, were it not that the form of the chapter, as well as several of its details, do not belong to Isaiah, but to a later writer or redactor. The sixty-five years in Isaiah vii. 8, after which Ephraim should cease to be a people, are part of a gloss.

We believe that where *definite* days or years are used, as one, three, seven, forty, they sometimes stand for round numbers, and are therefore *general designations of time*; sometimes both they and names of places were added by later hands, after the

¹ System der christlichen Lehre, sec. 35, p. 86 et seqq., fifth edition.

² Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen, p. 111 et seqq.

prophecy was fulfilled. Minute and specific traits of this nature should always be regarded as a presumption against the authenticity; because they are contrary to the general analogy of prophecy. In all cases, the interpreter should look, not so much to the fulfilment in detail, as to the occasion, circumstances, and motives in which the prophecy originated.

It is now commonly admitted, that the essential part of biblical prophecy does not lie in predicting contingent events, but in *divining the essentially religious* in the course of history. Historical proofs of the agreement of prophecy with its fulfilment are unimportant, unless the realisation be characterised in leading points, not in details. Prophecy portrays events in outline, which are always connected with the progress of the kingdom of God. It is to Schleiermacher we owe the true perception of its nature in modern times.¹ But while Tholuck admits that prophecy does not overpass the political horizon of the time, being related only to such worldly powers as are about to reach their zenith, he contends that the canon is not universal; and gives two notable exceptions.² One of these is derived from the thirty-ninth chapter of Isaiah, in which the Chaldee empire is described as a great power that should destroy Judea and take away the people captive. Hence it is thought that the Babylonian exile was foretold 150 years before it took place. Isaiah said to Hezekiah: "Behold the days come that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store until this day, shall be carried to Babylon; nothing shall be left, saith the Lord. And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon" (xxxix. 6, 7). This example of prediction does not hold good; because the chapter was not written in its present form by Isaiah himself. It is a later composition, posterior in time even to its parallel in 2 Kings xx., which is also later than Isaiah, though founded upon a historical work composed by the prophet. The probability is, that the later time at which the thirty-ninth chapter of Isaiah's book was written (as well as the twentieth chapter of the second book of Kings), materially contributed to its form and partly to its ingredients. No argument like Tholuck's can be founded upon it; because it is not Isaiah's authentic production. It is untrue that the genuineness of the chapter has never been doubted. The other passage adduced by Tholuck, after Hengstenberg, is Mic. iv. 10, which we shall hereafter show to be irrelevant. Micah does not predict the Babylonish captivity and deliverance, according to the

¹ Der christliche Glaube, i. p. 133; ii. p. 133.

² Die Propheten, u. s. w., p. 87, et seqq.

ordinary view of those events. Nor can the oracle of Balaam form a real exception, as long as its meaning is so obscure, in the part of it bearing on the question, the twenty-third and twenty-fourth verses of the twenty-fourth chapter of Numbers; for it is by no means certain that *Chittim* is either Macedonia in a narrower sense, or Greece, or the far west generally. Ewald's opinion is still the most probable, that the allusion is to an insurrection of the inhabitants of Cyprus against the mother country Phœnicia, by which the Assyrian coast was threatened.¹ Mention of such an event occurs in the Tyrian historian Menander, according to Josephus. Perhaps Tholuck will consider us as blind as Von Lengerke and Tuch in not seeing the incongruity of this explanation, because the Phœnicians were conquerors; but that circumstance does not essentially affect the oracle. This part of it at least belongs to the Assyrian period, and was unfulfilled. In its present form it could not have been uttered by Balaam.²

In like manner we might shew that Nahum's prophecy relating to Nineveh is no exception. He did *not* announce the ruin of that city about one hundred years before the event, as is often asserted. In proof of this we refer to our observations on the book of that prophet.

We may therefore safely assert that in no place or prophecy can it be shewn that *the literal predicting of distant historical events* is contained. Isaiah did not foretell the Babylonian captivity 150 years before, in the thirty-ninth chapter of his book. Neither did he predict Tyre's fall and ruin by the Chaldeans 130 years before the event, in the twenty-third chapter. Micah did not foretell the captivity in Babylon and deliverance from it 140 and 200 years previously. Nahum did not predict Nineveh's ruin 100 years before. The 70 years captivity in Babylon were not foretold by Jeremiah in that definite number, else he would have uttered what is not strictly correct, because the captivity did not last 70 years.

The prophets, though not always remaining in their own time, but occasionally glancing into the future, never tore themselves entirely loose from their own historical standpoint, except in ideal delineations of the Messianic age. The relations of their age were the starting point of their flight, conditioning and influencing both its elevation and form. They did not at times take their standpoint in the distant future and survey events thence, as Hengstenberg supposes; because the ethical scope of their prophecies, which is a characteristic of their nature, would be all but lost. Even in visions they were never

¹ Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol iii. p. 608.

² See Tholuck's Die Propheten u. s. w. p. 101.

entirely taken out of the circumstances and objects of their own time; much less were they so separated in their ordinary state. We find no warrant for identifying the condition of vision with that of ecstasy, and converting the exceptional into the usual, as Hengstenberg does. When the prophets *say* they had visions, visions may be assumed; but even then, the present was not *wholly* eliminated from their consciousness in all the forms and reflections of it; nor was their standpoint in the distant future. So far as they had a standpoint related to time, it was still in the present. In ardent hopes and poetical descriptions of a Messianic reign, they *did* project themselves into the distant future, but it was distant unconsciously to them; their usual method was to look no farther than the near future, as it unfolded itself out of the present to their purified vision. They foretold *such* a future as the present merged into; without distinct lines of separation between. "That which is to come," says Ewald, "presents itself before the prophet's spirit as with palpable form and features: what Jehovah wills and prepares, he beholds as with the clearest eye; while the world about him sees nothing of this wondrous light. This is the atmosphere in which the prophet feels, as it were beforehand, sooner and more acutely sensible than all other men, *the approaching future*; and is able, with delicate perception, to anticipate what others arrive at later and more roughly by experience: in which he discerns the inevitable calamity coming from God, while none else has yet marked anything of it, and is conscious of the divine wrath beforehand, from the fire glowing within his own soul."¹

It should be ever remembered that *prediction* was not the prophets' main object; though their discourses have often that form. The messengers of heaven should not be converted into something like heathen *soothsayers*; or made to foretell events in the manner of historians writing them beforehand. *Perspicuae rerum contingentium prædictiones*, "clear prediction of contingent things," according to the old theology, prophecy is not. What is an undeveloped germ of the future must not be transformed into a *historia ante eventum*, "history before it takes place." It is time, therefore, that books like those of Newton and Keith on the prophecies, based on a total misapprehension of the subject, should be discarded. They have done great injury, and violate the very interpretation of the letter which they professedly advocate. Where dim outlines connected present and future to the spiritual sight, *there* the prophets were foretellers. This *mode* of prediction, and *the extent* it

¹ Die Propheten des alten Bundes, vol. i. p. 24.

was carried to, is grounded in their proper function as heralds of truths relating to God's kingdom on earth. They had a deeper insight into the past and present than other men; because their inner eye had been opened by the Spirit to comprehend the causes at work in the moral government of the world, with the necessary results; and whoever comprehends past and present, sees into the future also, as Von Raumer has said.

Here Eichhorn's rationalistic view should be avoided, which is both shallow and incorrect, viz., that their oracles were for the most part veiled historical descriptions of the present or past.¹ This makes them hardly so much as guesses at the future. Rather does it impeach the prophets' transparent honesty of purpose, robbing them of their true position as men whom the Spirit of God elevated to a more extended view of divine providence in relation to the theocratic nation. Besides Eichhorn's view, two others are equally untenable, viz., that the allusions to the future are the product of human wisdom. Thus the experience of the prophets, their calm and reflective estimate of the different relations of life both of individuals and peoples, enabled them to glance correctly into the future; because they drew from past and present the proper materials for their survey. The second view is that their discourses contain nothing but human hopes and fears uttered under the inspiration of patriotism and poetic imagination, without much concern as to their fulfilment in the future. Both views may account for *some* phenomena, but neither is a sufficient explanation of all. They are defective in leaving out the divine element. The Spirit of God enlightened and sublimed the seers' minds, bringing them into near sympathy with God.² This appears most clearly from the fact, that certain events in the immediate future are sometimes foretold with great confidence, so that the prophets must have been sure they would take place, without doubt, in precise harmony with the announcement. *Authentic* oracles of this nature, though rare, are an evidence that an influence superior to human sagacity pervaded the spirits of the prophets. Such is Isaiah's predicting the impending downfall of the kingdoms of Syria and Israel; though when they threatened Judah, they were confederate and apparently strong (vii.). The repeated assurances given by the same prophet of the destruction of the Assyrian army before Jerusalem, belong to the same head (xxix.). So too Jeremiah's definite predictions of the return of the people from captivity. Express foretellings of individual events in the immediate

¹ In his *Die Hebräische Propheten uebersetzt und erklärt*, 3 Theile. Gottingem, 1816-1819, 8vo.

² See Bleek's *Einleitung*, p. 432 et seqq.

future were sometimes uttered by the prophets with a confidence that shewed unwavering faith in their exact fulfilment. Yet it must be granted that they are not numerous. As soon as an expositor has a desire to increase them, he is exposed to the error of taking prophecies whose authenticity is doubtful.

The prophet's delineations of the future are in essence nothing but *forebodings*,—efforts of the spiritual eye to bring up before itself the distinct form of the future. As such, they take in the final result, without the historical steps and stages leading to it, or its real, individual features. The thing *floats* before him. Hence he does not give a description of it, with detailed features as they occur in history. He sees times of prosperity as clearly as if they were near; but the course of events gradually unfolds numerous obstacles in the way of their speedy arrival. A period of final calamity does not arrive so soon as he expects; but the threatening is not on that account unfulfilled. Large allowance must be made for glowing hopes and holy desires. The poetry of an imagination strongly impressed by the Spirit of God must not be transmuted into a prosaic detail of events and circumstances. To make the prophet's presentiments of what is to happen in connexion with God's church into *historical declarations* is to mistake their character. A degree of vagueness belongs to them, because he cannot penetrate so clearly into the future as to fix times, seasons, and minute features. His predictions are projected and shaped by the glowing and varied longings of the imagination; by a clearer insight into the chain of causes and events than others possess; by a dream-waking which makes him a dim mirror of the future, where the province of ordinary knowledge is sometimes transcended so that things are foreseen which have not been in the sense-perception, but are quite beyond its conditions. For the *prevision* of the prophet, in its highest stage, belongs to that preconscious life of the soul which occasionally exhibits phenomena transcending its ordinary and conscious powers. It is *intensified presentiment*. In its ordinary stage, however, it does not transcend the conscious life into which powers and relations prepared in the preconscious nature have found their way, and vitalise it in consequence to a higher pitch. That the prophets did not always predict events as they were fulfilled, and occasionally foretold what remains unaccomplished, is an evidence that their consciousness was only *intensified*, and their spiritual eye, though bright, not all-seeing. That they penetrated into the future so far, and unfolded certain events with their most characteristic features, where neither a spontaneous calculation of probability nor the material of ordinary religious ideas, nor personal culture, affords an adequate explanation, shews that there is a precon-

scious region of the soul with which the divine Spirit, evoking its latent phenomena, has sympathetic relation.¹ The substance of their prophecies was not conveyed to them in words or dictated (a view *contrary to, and inconsistent with*, inspiration), but were the spontaneous utterances of a mind elevated by divine impulsions. Hence they are hardly susceptible of a literal fulfilment.

XIV. DOES THE OLD TESTAMENT TEACH THAT EVERY SINGLE PROPHECY MUST BE FULFILLED?—In Deuteronomy (xviii. 22) we read “When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.” These words appear clearly to assert that all true prophecies must be fulfilled, else they forfeit their character. But an attentive review of the whole range of prophecy tends to modify the sentiment. As a criterion for distinguishing the true from the false, an induction of particulars compels us not to rely upon it *absolutely* and *without exception*. If we compare Jeremiah (xxviii. 9), where it is said, “The prophet which prophesieth of peace, when the word of the prophet shall come to pass, then shall the prophet be known, that the Lord hath truly sent him,” we may get some aid in the explanation of the passage in Deuteronomy. The latter appears to refer to false prophets, whom it furnishes a test for trying. The sense of the passage in Deuteronomy is, when a prophet speaks of peace in the name of the Lord, then if the thing does not come to pass, the Lord has not spoken it. The false prophets prophesied of immediate prosperity, unconditionally. Hence their promises were frequently fallacious. But it is not said of every individual prophecy spoken by a true prophet that it must come to pass in the way its language would lead us to suppose.²

The dark pictures of the future with which the prophets threatened the enemies of their country—the special judgments described as about to befall them were *not* always literally accomplished. This is well known to the critical students of prophecy. In seeking such fulfilment violence may be done to the *intent* of the prediction, because neither the language of impassioned poetry and intense excitement, nor the diction of ardent desires and patriotic hopes, was meant for literal prose. In order to present general ideas more impressively to the mind of the reader, the prophet calls such principles, for example, as that God would punish the perverse among the people and deliver

¹ See Contributions to Mental Philosophy by J. M. Fichte, translated by Morell, chapters 3 and 4.

² See Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie, vol. iv. p. 350, et seqq.

the faithful from danger and misery, different sorts of punishment and different ways of preservation, without attaching any weight to these specific traits, or considering the truth of his prediction to be dependent on their exact fulfilment. Poetical hyperboles and imaginary details should be regarded as such. The prophet *individualises*, painting general truths in the *concrete* where we express them in the *abstract*. Such is the Oriental method. It is more graphic and lively than ours. Of course the special traits are usually formed from the historical relations of the time. Present circumstances suggest and shape them. Thus if some foreign power seems threatening in the distance, it is taken constituting burden of the punishment about to come upon the apostate. We read of Edom: "the smoke thereof shall go up for ever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever" (Is. xxxiv. 10). Travellers *have* passed through Idumaea.

Again, in seeking the fulfilment of predictions, the interpreter may be sometimes disappointed because unexpected changes arose to frustrate, at least for awhile, the events announced—changes which only the All-seeing One could foreknow. This is admitted even by Tholuck. The present place is not one for details, but a single example of a prediction's non-fulfilment may be given from Ezek. xxvi., where we now read that Tyre should be taken, plundered, and destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. No historian, either Greek or Phœnician, mentions such an event. The Seder Olam indeed speaks of its capture; but the document is of no authority. Nebuchadnezzar besieged the city thirteen years. We allow that the Tyrians *capitulated*, as Movers¹ has shewn, with whom agree Duncker² and Niebuhr.³ In consequence of this the inhabitants again became vassals of the Chaldeans. Is a capitulation, however, equivalent to such a *conquest* as the prophet describes? So Tholuck asserts, maintaining that the necessary conditions of a disgraceful surrender fully satisfy the requirements of xxvi. 9-13. But the prophecy says, "And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers; I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock. *It shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea*" (4, 5). In like manner we read in the fourteenth verse and onwards of the complete fall and total destruction of the city, which a capitulation does not fulfil, as Tholuck confesses.⁴ Surely, to take one part of the prophecy as a proper fulfilment,

¹ Die Phœnizier, II. 1, p. 461, et seqq.

² Geschichte des Alterthums, vol. i. p. 172.

³ Geschichte Assurs und Babels, p. 216.

⁴ Die Propheten, u. s. w. pp. 133, 134.

and relegate another to the department of poetical embellishment, is equivalent to the admission that as a whole it was not fulfilled. The language of Ezekiel in another place seems to convey the impression that Tyre was not conquered. "Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus: every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled: *yet had he no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus, for the service that he had served against it.* Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Behold I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, etc." (xxix. 18, 19, etc.). This passage may contain the prophet's confession that his prediction came to nothing because the siege was ineffectual, as Gesenius and Hitzig think. Or it may mean that the Chaldean army received no *adequate* reward for the immense labour they had in constructing the great earth wall, because the Tyrians had conveyed their treasures into their colonial cities. Egypt was not a proper equivalent. The latter view is the one adopted after Jerome, by Hengstenberg, Hävernicks, and Ewald. Long after Nebuchadnezzar, Tyre was a flourishing emporium, and was attacked by Alexander the Great. But Ezekiel predicts its total destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, so that it should be like the top of a rock and never rebuilt. Such desolation did not take place till the middle ages.

We need not refer to what is said of Babylon in Is. xiii. 14-21, and Jer. l. li., and its conquest by Cyrus, because Tholuck himself allows the accounts of Berosus and Herodotus to be irreconcilable with the prediction. Yet he makes an ingenious attempt to prove that the description of Xenophon in his *Cyropædia* agrees with the terms of the prophecy, thus exalting the credit of the latter at the expense of Herodotus. The attempt cannot be called successful. The prophets themselves attached no importance to the fact that each particular and detail in their prophecies should be fulfilled. They were always correct in the main respecting the future; for they took a spiritual and searching view of it in the light of the present. But every individual trait of their prediction was not literally carried into effect, and such non-fulfilment gave them no concern. Thus Isaiah was not embarrassed by the fact that Samaria's booty was not carried before Tiglath-pileser, as was announced to Ahaz (viii. 4); nor by Damascus not becoming a heap of ruins, and so ceasing to be a city (xvii. 1). Neither was Jeremiah disturbed by the circumstance that Zedekiah did not die a peaceful and honourable death like his father (Jer. xxxiv. 5, and lii. 11).

To this head belong the prophecies which speak of the Messianic age. Taken in their obvious and natural sense, they

were neither fulfilled *in the manner* nor *at the times* represented. The future age of Messiah, in which Israel should be preëminently glorious, is depicted as an entire revolution of existing circumstances—a new creation of some things, and the removal of existing evil. The position and functions of kings, judges, priests in the renovated church, are to be different. The theocratic people will have to contend with external foes no more. The attitude of other peoples towards them will be submissive and respectful. Jehovah shall be worshipped in truth. Special details are given not only of the institutions of worship, but even of weights and measures. This golden age is always represented as *at hand*. Jehovah himself says in Isaiah: “My righteousness is near; my salvation is gone forth,” etc. (li. 5). To whatever time the prophet belonged, he contemplated the setting up of the Messianic kingdom and glorification of Israel *as near*. The revolution in question is said to take place *at the end of days*, or in the *last days*, a phrase not denoting in the view of the prophets the far-distant future, but the interval between their present circumstances and the great change impending. To them were no long intervening centuries between their own day and that of redemption. As they were variously gifted and surrounded by different circumstances, the manner in which they paint the coming salvation is various. It is always connected with the divine judgment on the worldly power which threatens to destroy the theocratic state in the days of the individual prophet. His own historical circumstances form the definite circle of events and images out of which the future glory of Israel is described. Accordingly Isaiah and Micah announce the coming of the Messianic deliverance *after* the judgments which the Almighty should inflict on the Israelite states by the instrumentality of Assyria and the divine destruction of Assyria itself in immediate succession. In like manner, Jeremiah and Ezekiel describe the advent of Messiah’s reign after the Chaldean ravages of Jerusalem and the downfall of the Chaldean empire itself. In the former case, the historical basis of the portraiture is the actual relation of the Assyrian, in the other that of the Chaldean, period. The promised Messiah has his definite position in the one or the other according as the prophet himself belongs to either. Thus these men of God did not know the times and seasons which the Father has put in His own power; because they always believed in the speedy arrival of the Messianic age which was to be ushered in by judgments upon peoples and nations—on the neighbouring states of Moab, Edom, etc.; on the Assyrians; or on the Chaldeans.

But though the coming of Israel’s speedy redemption so often

announced was delayed from time to time, our faith in prophecy must not be shaken. The Jews did not lose confidence in it on that account. Hope always hastens to the consummation. The patriotism of these men of God was strong. They sighed and longed for the glorious time when Jehovah should create all things new. As far as they had a definite belief on the point, they thought redemption near. It was represented as at hand, in connexion with the downfall of their enemies, both to comfort the desponding hearts of their fellow-believers, and to warn transgressors.

There are various modes of explaining the prophecies we have been considering.

First. The living God is a God of freedom who sends His prophets, and is partly determined in His government of the world by the moral conduct of men. The prophets predict peace, which Jehovah is always ready to bestow. They announce the final completion of God's kingdom; and expressly state that there is no escape for transgressors. If a people or nation against whom judgment has been pronounced repent and turn, Jehovah will refrain from inflicting the punishment. Thus the fulfilment depends on moral conditions. God alters His purpose according to the conduct of those to whom it has been declared. He is merciful and gracious, not inflicting the evil denounced against those who turn from the error of their ways. If prophecies are conditioned in this manner, it is hardly proper to say that any are unfulfilled. Accomplishment and condition should be taken together, as things inseparably connected. This is the view taken by Bertheau, and developed at great length.¹ We cannot however adopt it as satisfactory, because it fails to account for many phenomena. Thus in the prophecies respecting the total destruction of Babylon by the Medes (Is. xiii.), the desolation of Tyre (Ezek. xxvi. and Is. xxiii.), the conversion of the Ethiopians, Egyptians, and Assyrians (Is. xviii. 19), not a word occurs about the possibility of the cities and peoples being changed, leading to the non-fulfilment of the judgments declared against them. It appears to us that this moral regulation of Jehovah's conduct is an expedient unsanctioned by the prophetic writings themselves. We should certainly expect its mention, at least by Ezekiel in his twenty-ninth chapter; because having predicted the *total desolation* of Tyre in the twenty-sixth, he expressly alludes to the non-fulfilment of the prophecy *after that fashion*; affirming that Egypt had been given to Cyrus for a compensation, instead of the rich Tyre. Here was an occasion for intimating the cause of the

¹ *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, Vierter Band, p. 335 et seqq.

Almighty's change of purpose, had it been dependent on the conduct of the Tyrians. The case of the Ninevites repenting at the preaching of Jonah, and so averting their predicted punishment, is adduced by Bertheau. But the analogy does not hold good; for Jonah was commanded to preach to Nineveh that it should be overthrown *within forty days*. The form of the prophecy is conditional, not absolute as in the case of Tyre. The authority for interposing the repentance of the citizens between the prophetic proclamation and their destruction lies in the very nature of the proclamation. The cases we have quoted contain nothing similar. In them the moral condition must be *assumed*. The same observation applies still more strongly to the other example quoted by Bertheau, viz., Jer. xxvi. The burden of Jeremiah's message from Jehovah to the inhabitants of Jerusalem is *repentance in order to avert the threatening curse*. *Conditional fulfilment* must be limited to the cases in which the condition is either expressed or implied, or where blessings and curses are pronounced on certain moral relations. To generalise it, as Bertheau does, is to endanger, if not to destroy, the characteristics of *prophecy*—of *prediction* undoubtedly. On such principles any one may foretell the future.

Secondly. According to Lord Bacon, the fulfilment of the divine predictions takes place continuously. While they pass through certain grades and stages of fulfilment, the plenitude and summit of their accomplishment are reserved for some particular time.¹ In accordance with this view, Koester supposes that every prophecy may be fulfilled as often as the conditions it presupposes are repeated. It has a continuous accomplishment.² Auberlen's view is substantially the same.³ He thinks that we must still look to the future for the accomplishment of many things predicted of Israel which have been but partially or imperfectly fulfilled in the past. On many grounds we object to the explanation in question. It is contrary to the established principle of historical interpretation, and confuses the method of an expositor. It takes out a few allusions to the event in which the prophet's countrymen were most interested, and reserves the remainder for fulfilment at some future time. Why should the historical circumstances out of which the prophecy arose and by which it is conditioned be expected again at a distant period? Is it because the traits to which they give rise do not find their counterpart in the first stage of fulfilment? If the prediction be a definite one, with specific

¹ De Augment. Scient. lib. ii. cap. 11.

² Die Propheten des alten und neuen Testaments, p. 309.

³ In his Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis; and in the Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie, Dritter Band, p. 778 et seqq.

details and allusions, these details, or at least some of them, are postponed by this critic to the future. Hence the Israelites must occupy a position similar to that in which they were when the prophet spoke. The peoples who opposed the theocratic nation are also to be in the same attitude. In short the Jewish relations of the old economy as they existed at a particular crisis must reappear. All this is highly improbable. It leads to assumptions arbitrary and unscriptural; such as the rebuilding of the temple and restoration of sacrifices. In all the shapes which the theory has taken in the hands of expositors, whether as proposed by Alexander or by Auberlen, it appears to us untenable. A prophecy which does not properly apply to one event, but to a number of successive ones spread over centuries, admits of no proper exegesis. The parts of it cannot be divided and assigned to the respective events. Besides, the explanation in question fails to account for the fact of Ezekiel first predicting the capture and destruction of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar and afterwards modifying his statement. Here the assumption of the prediction being a panoramic view of Tyre's fall, is inapplicable. To expect again the literal accomplishment of these Messianic prophecies *in the future* appears to us also unscriptural; involving considerations which Auberlen cannot have considered.

Thirdly. Some convert the descriptions of the prophets respecting future redemption into figures symbolising the Christian period, and so divest them of all their force and propriety. But Assyria and Egypt, Moab, Edom, and Magog are not mere representatives of the ungodly world-power; they are literally the kingdoms and states signified by the names. We cannot believe that the prophets overleaped the historical centuries between them and Christ. Such sudden springs are arbitrarily assumed. The whole theory rests upon the *ecstatic* state of the prophets, in which they are supposed to have seen things as in a picture. The older interpreters, who adopted mystical senses at will, may be classed under this head. They easily got over the difficulty involved in the non-fulfilment of certain predictions. Thus Tyre is the church of Rome, according to Cocceius on Is. xxiii.; Babylon in Is. xiii., xiv., is Antichrist. After the same fashion Israel is the Christian church; so that many things applied to the former are thought to be fulfilled in the history of Christianity. The evils of this interpretation are numerous. It introduces arbitrariness and uncertainty, severs passages from their proper connexion in the development of prophecy, and mars the correspondence between history and prophecy. By such capricious interpretation the gradual progress and growth of prophetism are greatly obscured.

Fourthly. Hengstenberg's view, which professes to avoid both this extreme and the opposite or literal interpretation, arises from the attempt to steer a middle course. According to him, we must carefully determine between fact and figure, which he proceeds to shew in a number of rules. But though he professes to maintain a historical basis, his method leads to a rationalising spiritualism with which V. Oettingen justly charges it. It must unavoidably do so; however much the author may guard against it. The eight rules he has given leave room enough for arbitrariness; and the historical consideration of prophecy loses at once both its value and significancy. He himself says: "As the prophets and their contemporaries were not always able to distinguish the figure from the literal meaning by means of the marks alluded to; so we are not always in a position to make this distinction with certainty, in the case of unfulfilled prophecies."¹ The figures under which the future was presented to the prophets were necessarily such as lay within the circle of their ideas, and were taken from the circumstances amid which they lived. So Hengstenberg asserts. In this manner each prophet took the people or nation most inimical to the theocracy at his own time, as the representative of the hostile world-power opposed to the church of God in the future. But when we put together and form into a united picture these various traits, the historical individuality belonging to each all but vanishes.

Fifthly. The only correct explanation is that which has been already given, which regards the prophets as still human, the laws of their minds being neither suspended nor violently interfered with. Gifted with the Spirit of God in a remarkable degree, they possessed more than ordinary foresight, and projected their vision into the future. They gave expression to anticipations and hopes in general and indefinite terms. Whenever they referred to specific events, however, they were liable to mistake. The more definitely they spoke of a future fact, especially one relating to the enemies of the theocratic people, the more liable were they to miss the mark. Sagacious and spiritual foresight directed to events in the history of the world rather than of Israel, was exposed to mistake. It is obvious that divine revelations coming through a human medium in accordance with its established laws and forming a part of its texture also, cannot be infallible. But these failures in the minor matters of the prophetic ministry do not vitiate the authority of its fundamental lessons. The prophet's exposition of the method of the divine government, of the kingdom of God on

¹ Christology, vol. iv. p. 439, English translation.

earth, and the duties of its subjects remains intact in all its integrity and value. The great principles of justice, purity, rectitude, and of homage to the Supreme are his theme; the essence of his divine message lying in them. As a Jew belonging to a narrow economy, he does not err in unfolding these principles; though he cannot usually get beyond the confines of the limitation imposed upon them by the imperfect nature of the theocracy to which he belongs. It is certain that the credit of the prophets does not rest on the occasional non-fulfilment of the political calamities they threatened, or of the blessings they promised. They relied on the doctrine of retribution, which holds good with respect to nations, in the present world. The fact that they were *seers*, with a spiritual standpoint and theocratic aim, did not include the ability to impart an exact knowledge of the future to their contemporaries. Their mission needed not *that* qualification. To affect the moral instincts, and through them the general conduct of a people that their heart and life may be right towards God, does not necessitate a gift of foreseeing events with infallible certainty. Bertheau often speaks with disapprobation of volatilising the prophecies, and he is right in so doing because Hengstenberg's view amounts to that; but we do not subject ourselves to the charge when we recognise failures of fulfilment in details. While making due allowance for tropical costume and hyperbolical figures, not understanding literally what is only *drapery*, we separate the literal from the figurative. What is vague anticipation must be treated as such. What is more specific should be regarded in the same light, not *idealised*.

The thing which has tended to make these failures appear more numerous and formidable than they are is the *individualising* method of the prophets, to which allusion has been already made. In the case of *leading events* the non-fulfilment of predictions rarely happens. It is chiefly in *details*. These should not be urged with the same force as main features which are destined to find their historical reality in the future. The *mode* of fulfilment, rather than the fulfilment itself, is what appears. Hence Tholuck employs the guarded expression that there are unaccomplished prophecies *in a certain sense*. Knobel's collection of them requires to be sifted.¹ Hitzig has added to the number without strengthening the view that they exist to any considerable extent. The prophets never erred in their anticipations and predictions as far as concerns the essential matter and significance of the obscure things belonging to the present and the future with which their spirit was occupied. In pointing out

¹ Der Prophetismus der Hebräer, vol. i. p. 303, et seqq.

the necessary and divinely established course of those obscure phenomena, they were not mistaken. Whatever was of highest, eternal import in the congenial themes that filled their souls, was always correct.

XV. MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.—The most important kind are the so-called *Messianic prophecies*, which were developed by degrees out of the ideal element contained in all prophecy. That ideal element arose out of the fact that the ruler or Israelite king was Jehovah's representative. Even in the first prophets that element rises to the idea of a great transformation of things in the future, when the theocracy converted into a world-kingdom shall embrace all nations of the earth and unite them in the common worship of the one Jehovah; while the people of God, after great purifying judgments, will also be inwardly transformed by an increased agency of the Divine Spirit, and become holy in truth—a nation of priests and prophets, in which nothing but truth and righteousness shall be found; a kingdom of God where the breach that sin introduced into the world—the separation between God and man—shall be healed, and primeval peace return to mankind and nature. All this is set forth in glowing colours. The idea has got the name *Messianic*, because it is connected with the mission of a king of David's stem, who is called in Hebrew "an anointed one." Messiah was to be the hero under whom the restoration of the chosen people should take place. The prophets, however, do not call him *Messiah*, not even those who lived after the return from captivity. He is merely a descendant of David, destined to invest the family of Jacob with a glory and prosperity unequalled in the palmiest days of his great ancestor. The title *Messiah* in the book of Daniel is no exception, because the work is late. The idea was not developed in its completeness till the exile. But the corresponding notes to it in the earlier prophets are also justly called *Messianic*, such as the judgment of the nations, their conversion to God, the universal dominion of right, the peace of God among men, in nature, etc.

The universal destination of the theocracy appears even at its establishment. Though not expressed from the commencement, it was contained in it in germ. It is partly implied in the call of Abraham, viz., in the addition that through him all the nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xii. 3; xxii. 18; xxvi. 5); partly at the introduction of the theocracy at Sinai in the declaration that the Israelite people should be a kingdom of priests, a holy race among the nations (Ex. xix. 5, 6; Lev. xx. 26; Deut. vii. 6, 14), implying that they should be a *priestly people*, a mediatorial nation for the earth. It is true that this idea is limited by the setting up of a particular priestly order;

but it was indicated from the commencement that the limitation should only be temporary; as appears from the fact that priests were regarded as representatives of the first born. To realise this idea and adapt it to the legal particularism of the Mosaic theocracy was the work of the prophets, who carried it out into the practical in the form of a restoration of the kingdom and people of God from their ruined state. Each prophet, however, had his own method of description within this common range.

1. Most represented the matter somewhat *politically*, by a sort of righteous dealing on the part of God in favour of His people; His taking vengeance on their enemies for their having oppressed the chosen ones; His subduing and crushing them beneath that very people and himself. Or, again, this righteous procedure is shewn in converting those enemies, so that they shall know and use the way of free access to God's kingdom. This is exemplified by the authentic Isaiah in particular.

2. Other prophets put it in a purely spiritual manner in the light of a *removal of the separation* made among the people by the Levitical priesthood and the prophetic order. This abolition of internal restriction is effected by a general outpouring of the Holy Spirit inspiring all the people, and therefore all the priests and prophets of the community. By this means the original conception of the phrase, "people of God," is restored. Examples occur in Joel iii.; and in substance, Jer. xxxi. 31, etc.; xxxii. 37, etc.; xxiv. 7.

3. Israel's position in the history of the world is developed with the deepest and most comprehensive meaning in the second, unauthentic part of Isaiah, which was composed in the time of the exile. Here the mission and destination of the Israelite people as *a prophet or messenger of the Lord* to the nations, are most clearly expressed. The realisation of the mission in question is effected in the way of historical development, viz., by *educating* the Israelite people in connection with a separation between *the true Israel* and those *nominally* so. This contrast of the two parties is worked up into organic form with great dialectical ability. It is concentrated into a process of development, especially in the person of the *servant of Jehovah*, meaning *the people of Israel*, partly *in fact*, partly *in idea*. The sinfulness of the nation requires judicial punishment, which reaches even to the destruction of the citizens. By such means sin is atoned for, and the remnant of the people purified that they may realize their prophetic calling. At the same time the process gone through is for the good of other peoples, in connection with Israel's destination in the world. Here we get, for the first time, the idea of *vicarious* suffering. And now their mission is fulfilled. They become a nation of prophets as well as of priests in the

world, with a mediatorial office in the kingdom of God, whose blessedness and excellency are described in glowing colours. In all this the conception of God's kingdom is expressed *purely*, without a political or theocratic form, and especially without mention of a ruler, a Messiah. This is the culminating point of Hebrew prophetism, forming a new epoch in its development. But it was suppressed for a time, in the period immediately succeeding the exile, by a hierarchical reaction. Christianity resumed and adopted it.

In conformity with the analogy of prophecy generally, *special predictions* concerning Christ do not appear in the Old Testament. Though the fathers tried to find them there—Justin, Origen, and others—the Jews acutely objected, and disproved their arguments. It was not till the Deists of the eighteenth century and the critico-historical interpretation of rationalism had shewn the untenable nature of *special* Messianic predictions as a leading evidence of revelation, that the fact came to be reluctantly admitted by evangelical critics. The Messiah of the prophets and the kingdom they sketch, is not the Jesus of the New Testament and the church he founded. Yet the two are not separated. If the truths and institutions of the Old Testament be the *preparative* and *preformation* of the development embodied in christianity, the latter becomes *the realisation* of the former. For Schleiermacher's assertion, that christianity in its characteristics, stands in the same relation to Judaism as to heathenism, is certainly false.¹ The prophets themselves could not separate the essential and permanent, which was destined to abide because reproduced in christianity, from the temporal form and theocratic envelope in which it was conveyed. This can only be done from a New Testament point of view. They did not *consciously adapt* their anticipations of the future development of humanity to the nature of the New Testament state. From the error of supposing so, the theory of a double sense originated, a higher and lower, a literal and a spiritual, which has led to so much false interpretation, and is as baseless as the Judaising tendency that adheres to the letter so slavishly as to understand what is stated about the return of Israel to their own land, their occupation of the Gentiles' countries, the new temple and sacrificial worship, in a *carnal sense*. Theocratic dress should not be confounded with what it clothes and contains—the everlasting truths that reappear in Christianity without a Jewish face.²

It is not consistent with our purpose or limits to give a full outline of Old Testament *christology*. It can only be gathered

¹ Glaubenslehre, § 12, p. 77.

² See Tholuck, Die Propheten, u. s. w., p. 146, et. seqq.

out of the prophets and preceding books by a careful induction of passages. And that task is rendered more difficult by the fact, that prophetic canonical literature does not present a very regular development of the Messiah's person, work, and time. Sometimes a later prophet occupies a less advanced stage of perception than an earlier one; and none expresses more than a part of the compound idea resulting from all together.

At the commencement of Genesis, victory over the evil principle is promised to humanity. In Abraham it is restricted to the Semitic race. But Messianic hopes, properly so called, did not originate so early. The ideas which lie at the basis of the Messianic prophecies are simple; and must have been natural in the minds of the better part of the Israelites, who, from the relation they sustained to Jehovah, were convinced of the vanity of heathenism and the certainty of its abolition, either by the destruction or conversion of idolaters. Israel could not cease because of the everlasting covenant made with them; and therefore their future must be glorious whether all other nations should perish or be converted to their faith. As to the *form* in which Israel was to continue, they knew that a divine promise connected the sovereignty with David's race. The throne of David was to be eternal. Such are the ideas lying at the foundation of the Messianic prophecies. The diversities apparent in the portraiture arise from the ways in which the sacred writers grasped the ideas in question. They gave prominence to this idea or that, put one in the back ground, or omitted it altogether, to place another in the fore ground. Hence Nicolas has correctly found the origin of the Messianic hopes in three things,—the nature of Israel's race, their religion, and their history. The Hebrew character has ever been tenacious, self-contained, self-trusting. In circumstances of the greatest adversity the Jews never doubted of the safety of the race; indeed their confidence grew with their difficulties. They always clung to the belief of their preservation. Bright dreams sprang up on the soil of deep humiliation. Again, the Mosaic religion being set forth as a covenant between Jehovah and the house of Jacob—a covenant often renewed—tended to flatter the pride of the people. They were the special favourites of the Almighty, whom He had chosen as his own, and to whom He gave repeated tokens of his protection. All other nations were excluded from His favour. Thus they cherished the notion of their own superiority. But when the nation was divided, after the death of Solomon, and ruin seemed impending over it, present calamities turned the thoughts of the pious to the future, to look for the fulfilment of the divine promises. After chastisement and oppression, they believed that the Most High would have com-

passion upon them and remember His covenant. The people would return to the Lord, and the Lord would return to them; a new era would dawn upon the house of Jacob—a period of prosperity, holiness, victory, and universal dominion—which should witness the accomplishment of the gracious promises made to the fathers. Thus the Messianic expectation arose after David, at a time of national deterioration; the kingdom being rent into two rival ones, and calamities apparently incurable having fastened themselves on the posterity of Abraham. It was then that darkness begot the dream of a bright future—a reign of universal peace, supremacy, and splendour.

We have already seen that these Messianic hopes assume different forms and limits among the individual prophets. In some they are higher, more comprehensive, more spiritual; in others, narrower and more earthly. But still there is a general development whose outlines at least can be traced. Their original compared with their ultimate state is imperfect. From 2 Sam. vii. 12, 13, it is observable that though limited at first to the family of David and a worthy successor on his throne, they gradually expand. In the reign of Rehoboam they rise no higher than the re-establishment of the nation's unity under a descendant of David. An era of prosperity first appears in Joel. Micah mentions an extraordinary ruler of David's race to be born at Bethlehem (v. 1), who should introduce everlasting peace and an unlimited dominion over all nations. In Isaiah and Jeremiah, especially the former, glowing pictures are presented of the re-establishment and prosperity of the nation; but the description of the future deliverer is still vague. He is a *sprout* or *branch* from David's stem. Nothing is stated as to the *nature* of his birth, either in Isaiah or Micah. After the return from captivity the Messiah is described in a different manner. Instead of the victorious hero of David's family restoring the throne of his great ancestor and ruling over the whole world after conquering all other nations, he is one of the two sons of oil or anointed ones (Zech. iv. 14). His warlike equipment is laid aside; he conquers neither by might nor by power, but by the Spirit of the Lord. He is the messenger of the covenant who comes to purify the sons of Levi. A sacerdotal cast corresponding to the prevailing characteristic of the time when Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi flourished belongs to the representations they give of the great Deliverer: he is a royal priest in the midst of an organised church where Levi's sons perform their functions; not a mighty ruler putting his foes under his feet and establishing Israel's universal sway. And these hopes of the post-exile prophets are supposed to be on the point of fulfilment. The advent of Messiah is not far away in the indefinite future,

but immediate. He shall visit the rebuilt temple ; the glorious era is at hand ; and the ancient promises are on the eve of accomplishment. Haggai and Zechariah saw the Messiah in Zerubbabel, who was of the family of David, for both speak of him in exalted terms, and the latter calls him *the Branch* (vi. 12), affirming that "he shall bear the glory and shall sit and rule upon his throne ; and he shall be a priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both." But the high hopes of the people respecting the commencement of Messiah's reign at the rebuilding of the temple were soon disappointed ; so that Malachi, half a century after Haggai and Zechariah, puts the advent of the great day of the Lord into the obscure future.

In this account of Zechariah we are compelled to differ from Ewald who supposes that the prophet looked out for the brightening of the first rays of Messianic hope into actual manifestation in the immediate future, because they were linked to Joshua and Zerubbabel, the priestly and the kingly, that now worked together for the restoration of Judaism. As crowns were put on the heads of both, and also laid up in the temple for a memorial, the critic thinks that the Messianic hope would not be fulfilled forthwith, according to the prophet's belief. The two illustrious persons were rather in Zechariah's view the precursors of Messiah's advent—prelibations of his person and sway. They were the incipient fulfilment of the union which should characterise Messiah's reign, agreeably to Jeremiah's prophecy (xxiii. 17-26).¹ Ingenious as this hypothesis is, we cannot adopt it. Of course Zechariah saw what he describes only in spirit, agreeably to the genius of later prophetism : the transactions were not outward or actual occurrences.

The Messiah's relation to God is expressed in various ways ; not his equality with Jehovah, nor his proper, independent, god-head. Whether he be intended by *the angel* or *messenger* of Jehovah is not clear. In some places at least that angel is identified with Jehovah himself. All that can be said with truth is, that god-like qualities are ascribed to the predicted Messiah. The degree of his relationship to God is vaguely expressed. As a prophet he teaches by his word. As a priest he dedotes himself to the good of the righteous. As a king he subdues all his enemies and reigns over an obedient world.

The Messianic time is described as the close of the history of God's kingdom on earth. Hence the prophets speak of *those days, the last days, the days to come, the end of days, the time of the end*. The Messianic future commonly terminates the horizon

¹ See Nicolas, *Etudes critiques*, p. 418 et seqq.

² *Jahrbuch*, xi. pp. 270, 271.

of the prophet's vision. It often happens that the conversion of the heathen is represented as the immediate result of the divine proceedings in Israel, which is followed by the Messianic future; for intervening periods were mostly concealed from the sight of the seer.¹

It is instructive to observe that several prophets make no definite promise of a single person as the Saviour; such as Joel, Amos, Zephaniah, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, the Deutero-Isaiah. All had not a perception of the future salvation *in connection with an individual*. By a number of persons—for example, the true God-fearing Israelites—some supposed that the glory intended for the covenant people should be brought in. So the Deutero-Isaiah thought. The Messianic reign was depicted by others as introduced by Jehovah himself, the Protector of Israel, no human deliverer being definitely set forth.²

XVI. DICTION AND STYLE OF PROPHECY.—The *diction and language* of prophetic discourse is animated. Hence it assumes the external form of poetry, *i.e.*, *rhythm*. Yet there is a difference between prophetic rhythm and that of lyric poetry. The former has longer periods and so far approaches prose. It may be termed *oratorical prose*. Some prophets have the highest lyrical elevation; others are softer, flowing, elegiac. The post-exile ones become gradually feebler, and sink down almost into prose. As to the *oratorical form*, it consists—

First, of symbolical transactions frequently prefixed to their discourses as a kind of text to indicate the contents, *e.g.*, when the prophet Ahijah appears before Jeroboam, and tears his mantle into twelve pieces (1 Kings xi.). In Jer. xxvii. 2, it is related that the prophet put a yoke on his neck (the foreign yoke of submission); compare too Ezek. v. But some of these symbolic actions are equivalent to *nota bene*s, things which did not really take place before the eyes of the people, but are only *related*, *e.g.*, such as extended over a long period (Ezek. iv.). So also when Hosea receives a command to take unto him a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredom—a thing morally wrong. Yet Kurtz and Neumann regard this *visionary* symbolical act as a *historical fact*.³ Jeremiah is commanded to carry a girdle to the Euphrates, where it rots. We may hence conclude that even the practicable actions were not all carried out.

Secondly, the oratorical form consists of visions, *i.e.*, immediate perceptions of significant objects in dreams or the waking state. Their import is the same as that of symbolical actions.

¹ See Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer*, vol. i. § 26, p. 328, et seqq.

² See Bleek's *Einleitung*, pp. 438, 439.

³ Kurtz's *Die Ehe des Propheten Hosea*, 1859. Neumann's *Jeremias von Anathoth*, 1856, 1858, 2 vols. 8vo.

Visions are found even in the oldest prophets, *e.g.*, Amos vii.-ix.; Jer. i. Isaiah presents a masterly specimen of vision, both with respect to its simplicity and the significancy of each individual trait. But Ezekiel is somewhat fantastic in the use of them. Among the later prophets visions are much more frequent, and at the same time stranger, till at last they become nothing more than a species of prophetic drapery. Examples occur in Daniel and the Apocalypse. The word of God thus becomes a series of images, and the speaker an enraptured seer, shewing a feebleness of the prophetic spirit; for *the word* requires something stronger than mere fancy. And this weakness of the prophetic force again is a consequence of the opposition between the kingdom of God and that of the world, an opposition arising from the broken state of the people whose freedom and moral energy are impaired. The existence of visions as drapery is intimately connected with such a condition of the nation. These two things, *symbolical transactions* and *visions*, make up the symbols of prophecy, and should be judged by oriental taste. It is not easy to draw a line between symbolical actions which were merely *internal*, confined to the minds of the prophets themselves, and therefore merely *visionary*, and such as were *objective facts*. Perhaps the following considerations will help to distinguish them.

1. Some were impossible. Thus Ezekiel was commanded to lie on his left side 390 days, and 40 days on the right. He was also ordered to take a wine cup and send it to all the nations to drink of. Accordingly he is said to have taken it to the kings of Egypt, Arabia, Persia, Media, etc., and to "all the kings of the earth far and near" (Jer. xxv. 15). Ezekiel was ordered to take the roll of a book and eat it (ii. 9; iii. 2, 3).

2. Others contain what is unworthy of God, or inconsistent with decency. To this head belongs the command addressed to Hosea to take a wife of whoredoms (i.). Ezekiel was ordered to bake with man's dung the bread he ate, as he lay on his side.

3. Sometimes the means and end do not correspond. Such is the direction given to Jeremiah to put a linen girdle on his loins, go to the Euphrates, and hide the girdle in a hole of the rock. He does so, and returns from the long journey; but after many days goes back to take the girdle from its place, and it is found good for nothing (Jer. xiii.). This is said to prefigure the people's destruction.

"We must remember," says John Smith, "that the prophetic scene or stage upon which all apparitions were made to the prophet, was his imagination, and that there all those things which God would have revealed unto him were acted over symbolically, as in a masque, in which diverse persons are brought in, amongst which the prophet himself bears a part; and there-

fore he, according to the exigency of his dramatical apparatus, must as the other actors perform his part, sometimes by speaking and reciting things done, propounding questions, sometimes by acting that part which in the drama he was appointed to act by some others; and so, not only by speaking, but by gestures and actions, come in, in his due place among the rest, as it is in our ordinary dreams, to use Maimonides' expression of it. And therefore it is no wonder to hear of those things done which indeed have no historical or real verity; the scope of all being to represent something strongly to the prophet's understanding, and sufficiently to inform it in the substance of those things in which he was to instruct that people to whom he was sent. And so sometimes we have only the intelligible matter of prophecies delivered to us nakedly, without the imaginary ceremonies or solemnities. And as this notion of those actions of the prophets that are interweaved with their prophecies is most genuine and agreeable to the general nature of prophecy, so we shall further clear and confirm it in some particulars.¹ The same view is given by Maimonides.

It should be observed that *visionary* symbolical actions are different from *visions* or real internal phenomena presented to the inner eyes of the spirit. *Visions proper* should not be converted into the kind of phenomena of which we have been speaking. Thus in Ezek. viii.-xi. the prophet says he was transported to the door of the court. He had a real vision.

In the earlier prophetic period when oral teaching was the mean employed, it is most likely that the symbolical actions were really performed. They fell in with the manner in which the prophets performed their duties, *i.e.* by word of mouth. But when writing became general, and oral delivery of their messages less frequent in proportion, symbolical actions were commonly internal and visionary.²

XVII. HISTORIC PERIODS OF PROPHECY.—The prophetism of the Old Testament properly begins with Samuel and ends with Malachi, *i.e.* from 1100 till 400 B.C., occupying a period of about 700 years. In a certain sense indeed it may be dated from Moses, whose theocratic religion laid the basis on which the prophets founded their animating lessons. But the proper theocratic fruit did not appear till prophetism became an *institution* under Samuel. This may be divided into four sections, first, the older one 1100–850 B.C.; the second, 850–650 B.C.; the third, from Josiah till the downfall of Judah 630–584 B.C.; the fourth, 584–400 B.C.

1. Till the reigns of Jehoash of Judah and Jehoahaz son of Jehu of Israel, *i.e.*, till 855. In this incipient period the

¹ Select Discourses, p. 239, ed., 1821.

² Bleek, Einleitung, pp. 426, 427.

prophets were characterised by action and energy. They stood apart from the people in their original power. Hence they were respected and obeyed without much opposition. There was a certain rough wildness about them which shews a rude and uncultivated state of society. Appearing as a foreign and awe-inspiring manifestation of the divine power, they set themselves like a wall against heathenism, and put forth uncommon energy against earthly potentates. But they did not penetrate far into the spiritual life of the mass. They rather overpowered the people by the magnitude of their deeds and the pregnant force of their words. They inspired *awe* more than *love* into the populace, who looked upon them as persons removed from their own sphere of humanity by the exhibitions of a marvellous energy that struck directly at its object. They were not cultivated speakers. What they said was a spontaneous outburst of zeal. Their addresses must have been brief and simple, of an admonitory, threatening, censuring, and promising style. They were vehement and practical; without poetic ornament, oratorical fullness, or far-reaching comprehensiveness, yet pointed, pithy, and pregnant with the poetry of patriotic passion. The questions with which prophecy was now occupied were less important, being incidental topics relating immediately to the events of the day, though remotely connected with the kingdom of God. The defects belonging to such prophetism were those which adhered to it out of the pre-Mosaic, heathen period. Occasionally it exhibited a tinge of superstition, and shewed some symptoms of the lower stage of prophetic inspiration in which *feeling* has undue predominance over *consciousness*. The *seer*-state was only passing away. A settled order of prophets had been recently instituted. If Elijah be taken as the type of the time, a remarkable influence of the Spirit rested upon him. His example and energy raised up a number of disciples, diffusing the spirit of prophecy, but lessening its internal force in proportion. As the prophetic schools were in Israel, the prophets were more numerous in that kingdom; and probably were more united in their efforts. They coöperated in their great work of upholding and developing the theocracy. And their functions were less distinct from those of the priests than afterwards; for Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha sometimes offered sacrifices. Besides Elijah and Elisha, we have Shemaiah, Micaiah son of Imlah, and Joel.

2. From the ninth till the seventh century, till Manasseh. This is the most flourishing period of prophecy. Compared with the former it is marked by a great change, especially from the commencement of the eighth century. Hitherto prophetism was mainly occupied with the triumph of the Mosaic ceremonies.

Its chief object was to overthrow the altars of strange gods, and rear others to the honour of Jehovah. The idea which the prophets had entertained of Mosaism was imperfect, because they looked at it in the concrete—as an assemblage of ritual practices and institutions. A purer and more elevated conception of it was now acquired. It presented itself as an internal power, purifying the conscience, and controlling the life *from within*. The eternal truths of a divine kingdom in the world were apprehended in a manner somewhat befitting their nature. Prophetism began to be in fact what it had been only in theory before—the ministry of the word and spirit. After the state of morals in the northern kingdom had deteriorated in the long and prosperous reign of Jeroboam II., the prophets raised their voice against prevailing vices rather than disloyalty to Jehovah and his worship. In this way ethics more than ritual came to occupy their thoughts, and led them forward to a better form of theocratic truth. This was particularly the case in the southern kingdom which was always in advance of the northern, because the latter was characterised by a military government, which necessarily produces a certain rudeness of manners. The development of prophecy is most marked in Israel, because almost all the prophets of the period belonged to that kingdom. There is little doubt, however, that the transformation took place in both kingdoms, though not in the same degree. Prophetism generally assumed a culture and spirituality almost unknown to preceding seers. It reached its highest stage of development by grasping the spiritual sense of the theocracy, more from causes within itself than outward circumstances; though the latter were not without their influence in bringing about its transformation.

Having attained to this elevated platform, the prophets exerted great influence not only in relation to their own but succeeding times. We have now their loftiest manifestation as speakers and writers together. They spoke and wrote with a living freshness corresponding to the fullness of their minds. Writing was with them the consequence of public speaking and acting. They were authors because they were religious orators of the highest order, enunciating spiritual truths of general importance to mankind. The universal questions of all time occupied their thoughts. Accordingly they present more marks of culture than their predecessors. Their addresses are longer and more profound; more poetic or oratorical in form, as they appear at least in writing. Not only do their popular discourses approach in character to the literary, but even what they did not orally deliver was committed to writing, to serve as permanent instruction for the people of God. Thus they furnish a proper prophetic literature.

Violent gesticulations and outward signs were less prominent—a fact which also shews a higher development. *The word itself* was the great characteristic. Kingship, no longer overawed by prophetic power, now began to measure itself with prophetism, even in Judah. The worship of idols had insinuated itself into the same kingdom. Manasseh and Ahaz sacrificed their sons to Moloch. Thus caprice set itself in opposition to the objective powers of the law and prophecy. Where it prevails, scepticism and atheism are the result. Favoured by such circumstances, false prophecy soon acquired an influence. Monarchs persecuted and murdered true prophets: false ones were safe. Isaiah may be taken as the type of the time, as he is the highest in it. Besides him, there are Amos, Micah, Habakkuk, Zechariah (latter part), perhaps Obadiah, all in Judah. Hosea belonged to Israel. It is not easy to estimate the difficulties which the prophet had now to encounter. They arose both from kings and the priestly caste, chiefly the former. The servants of God were not at once respected and obeyed. They were often ridiculed and scorned. Sovereigns were not willing hearers of their threatening messages. The greatest obstacle, however, was from within the order itself. Some forgot their high calling, and yielded to the flatteries of the great. Tempted away from genuine virtue, they lowered their character and position. These, therefore, had to be withstood. All the resources and capabilities of the true prophets were called forth to overcome such defection. And they were often successful in encountering their dangerous enemies. Self-denial and freedom were qualities which they exhibited abundantly.

3. In the third period, from Josiah till the destruction of Judah as a kingdom, the sinking of prophecy is clearly discernible. False prophets had almost suppressed it. Yet the voices of Nahum and Zephaniah are still heard. At last Jeremiah appears, the type of all the prophets in their self-denying labours and sore suffering. In him the moral is put above the ceremonial law, as in Isaiah, Micah, and others of the preceding period. The *prophet* prevails over the *priest*. Spiritual conceptions of the theocracy are manifest in his writings. He insists upon moral sentiments and the promptings of conscience as acceptable to God; while sacrifices and holocausts are represented as of no avail in themselves. His spiritualism is fully equal to that of Isaiah, if not superior to it. Away from Palestine, on the banks of the Chaboras, Jeremiah's disciple Ezekiel preaches to the exiles till the sixteenth year after the destruction of Jerusalem. In him appears the beginning of the formalist tendency, which became dominant after the restoration from Babylon. As he could not wholly withstand its influence, he

forms the point of transition between his predecessors prior to the captivity and such as lived at the return. His thoroughly religious sentiments, however, are distinctly seen. The spiritualism of Jeremiah left deep traces upon him. But his visions are artificial and fantastic. When a prophet substitutes written for spoken discourse in his leisure hours, he is liable to become feebler, by losing the living breath of genuine inspiration.

4. During the captivity, we have some fine specimens of prophecy. The Deutero-Isaiah takes a comprehensive range, and a more spiritual view of the theocracy than Isaiah himself. In elevation and power his discourses occupy a conspicuous place. But Zechariah equals him in *depth* of vision. The prophets are now *writers* rather than *speakers*, substituting the *written* for the *oral*. This accounts for the fact that visions appear more frequently; visions, too, of an artificial nature, evidencing decay. Old oracles are repeated. The ideas of the old prophets reappear. It was an age of the exposition and evolution of truths which had been unfolded before. The copying of images and words in their predecessors is apparent, which is tantamount to a sinking of the true prophetic spirit. These prophets indeed labour for the restoration of the theocracy in a better form than it had yet assumed; yet most were tinged with the ritualism of their time. This is the distinguishing feature which separates them from their predecessors, who give no more than a secondary importance to the ceremonial part of the law; while Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi insist on the necessity of fulfilling its prescriptions. The rebuilding of the temple is a great object in their sight—a thing right and proper in itself, but not so primary as they represent it. Tithes and offerings are viewed as a debt contracted to God himself; and marriages with strange peoples, the Ammonites, Moabites, and others, are forbidden as violations of the Mosaic precepts. Outward religion consisting in ceremonials is enjoined, much more than purity of heart or obedience to conscience. The sacerdotal element had acquired the predominance over the prophetic, and therefore it is said that *the priest's* lips should keep knowledge, since he, not the prophet, is the messenger of the Lord of hosts (Mal. ii. 7). God is said to have made with Levi, the priestly race, a covenant of life and peace, a thing unknown before in the sacred books, shewing at the time a very different relation between priest and prophet from what had subsisted when the priests were the opponents of the prophets in thwarting their ministry as they were able. It is instructive to behold how the prophets of this period were affected by the prevailing formalism, so that the sacerdotal office assumed an exaggerated importance in their eyes.¹

¹ See Nicolas's *Études critiques*, etc., p. 428, et seqq.

It is very likely that the prophets wrote at first short, pregnant words, serving as texts for oral discourses, which they put up in public places. References to tablets are found in Isaiah and Habakkuk, the former having written a significant name, *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*, on a smooth plate (Is. viii. 1); while the latter was commanded to write a vision upon tables, and make it so plain that hasty passers could read the large characters at a glance.

When addresses were committed to writing, we do not suppose that they were noted down either literally or exactly. They were enlarged, revised, recast, and improved. Some were written that had never been spoken, such as the oracles of Joel, Nahum, and Habakkuk. Most of Ezekiel's also were committed to writing at first and exclusively. The extended description of the temple in the concluding chapters was not orally delivered. Occasionally they themselves collected their own writings, as Joel and Habakkuk did. At other times they left them in separate parts, which posterity put together in different ways. A collection of oracles, or a *book*, was termed a *book of Jehovah*, סֵפֶר יְהוָה (Is. xxxiv. 16). Jeremiah dictated his prophecies to Baruch, who wrote them in a roll; and when Jehoiakim ordered it to be burnt, he dictated them anew (Jer. xxxvi.).

The entire prophetic literature of the Old Testament is not extant. Our present books are only a part of what antiquity possessed. They are the greater part, however; for in Jeremiah, where most references to older books occur, passages from lost oracles are hardly found. The fact of *some* prophetic literature being no longer extant might be inferred *a priori*, from the extent of what we have, which bears little proportion to the number of prophets. Hosea refers to an unknown oracle (vii. 12), where the translation should be, *according to the oracle* (or prophesying) *to their congregation*; not as Gesenius (Lex.) has it, *as the report has come to their congregation*. In Is. ii. 2-4 and Mic. iv. 1-4, the same extract from an older prophecy is given.

Very few of the prophetic books are now in their original state. They have been arranged and disposed by later hands. Most have suffered greater or less alteration, subsequently to the original writers themselves. Jeremiah's have been most freely dealt with, so that the original text can hardly be recovered. Glosses have intruded here and there into many pieces, not only in Jeremiah, but others. Collectors and compilers did not confine themselves to the mere business of arrangement in their own way, nor were they always content with prefixing inscriptions. They took greater liberties. Here, however, it is all but impossible to detect and develop the processes through which the books passed before they assumed their present state. The higher criticism is scarcely equal to the task, because so little

tangible evidence is forthcoming. Subjectivity is apt to run into excess in such a region. Yet something ~~can~~ be done, difficult as the subject is, if caprice and conjecture be checked by sober judgment. Perhaps Ewald, in giving scope to his ingenuity, has gone to excess in his investigations of the topic; yet he has done what is worth attention.

XVIII. COMPLETION OF HEBREW PROPHECY IN CHRISTIANITY. —Christianity may be generally described as a reaction of the suppressed prophetic spirit against the degeneracy of religion into mere statutes and formalism. It is the reanimation, or rather the *restoration* and *completion* of prophetism, the conciliation of prophetism and priesthood in a higher unity. It appears as the fulfilment of the old Messianic promises, realising the original idea of God's kingdom, which is that of one *holy, spiritual people* (Ex. xix. 5, 6). That idea suffered a temporary limitation in Mosaism, by reason of the hard-heartedness of the Jewish people, through the peculiar institute of the Levitical priesthood. The limitation in question was destined to be removed in the future, after the Hebrew people had been purified by the general outpouring of the divine Spirit on all classes, consecrating them prophets and priests and so doing away with the Levitical priesthood as an intermediate office. The promise has been fulfilled by Christ, both *negatively* and *positively*. *Negatively* it has been accomplished by his atonement, in which he redeems mankind from the slavery of sin, and reconciles them to God. *Positively*, he effects it by the communication of the divine Spirit to believers to live in them, and so individual Christians appropriate to themselves the words of redemption and reconciliation. This spirit of Christ is *sonship* and its privileges, i.e., free unrestrained communion with the Father, no longer conditioned by any mediator, but by Christ himself. It is easy to see how this becomes the foundation of a kingdom of God on earth in higher potency, viz., the christian church, or the great congregation of the saints. Such a community embraces all who are chosen out of the world and have entered into fellowship with God—who have, as it were, died with Christ to the world, and are born again to a new life in God. Hence the church is the community of the faithful, consisting of a holy people belonging to God, as was the case in the Old Testament, but is now in a higher and truer sense in the New (1 Pet. ii. 9; 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16).

The essence of Christianity is *holiness*, the priestism of men and of human life; or, in other words, *purity*, dedication to God not *externally* but in the *inner nature*. Hence it is not represented as belonging to a peculiar condition, but extending to all Christians, who, however poor and humble they appear, have a holy office in the kingdom of God. Christians are not separated

from the world outwardly, but placed in the midst of it as salt and leaven—the spirit that animates it—a result which can only be effected by intercourse and mutual converse. The world is not a *thing* which they are to flee from, but to fight against, as we do against our corrupt nature. This is a wholesome counterpoise to separatism on the one hand, and an overstrained striving after purity on the other. Such is the conception of the external church, consisting of the spiritual and secular. Accordingly all are spiritual in this kingdom (1 Cor. ii. 10, etc; Gal. vi. 1), because they have the Spirit of Christ (1 Cor. xii.). Hence, too, they are all priests, so far as they have free access to God by Christ's Spirit and redemption, and are called to serve him as well as to promote his will and kingdom. In the case of individuals, this is especially shewn in the manifestations of Christian life, and the duties of the Christian vocation, things borrowed from the function of the Old Testament priesthood. Thus in relation to their *priesthood*, a spiritual self-sacrifice is imposed upon Christians, or, in other words, a continuous crucifying of the carnal life, and a cleaving to God with soul, body, and substance. Hence we read in Rom. xii. 1, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service;" Phil. ii. 17, "Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all;" Phil. iv. 8, "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things;" Heb. xiii. 15, "By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name." Another principal part of the priestly performances is prayer, praise, and thanks, both for self and others (Matt. xviii. 20; Ephes. vi. 18, etc.; 1 Tim. ii. 1, etc.; James v. 14, etc.). This is the only sacrifice that remains, since Christ has abolished all sacrifices by the one offering of himself. And as to the *prophetic* office, it consists in the announcement of God's will. Christians make known the divine purposes and ways towards man. They have *knowledge*, especially through the diligent study of Scripture to which all are called; or at least they have the capacity for inquiring into revelation, and are bound to search it, because it has been written by means of God's Spirit (1 Cor. ii.; 2 Cor. i. 12; Ephes. i. 17, etc.). They have all in like manner certain duties, because they are commanded to try the spirits (Matt. vii. 15; Acts xvii. 11; 1 John iv. 1). And they have to *spread their knowledge*, because it must not be concealed. On the contrary, they should testify of divine

truth for the edification of the brethren, according to their measure of faith and the opportunities afforded them. By admonition, doctrine, reproof, and threatening, their duty is to hold forth the word of life (Matt. xviii. 15, etc.; Rom. xv. 5, 6, 14; 1 Thess. i. 8; Gal. vi. 1, etc.). Accordingly in the first meetings of the early Christians, edification was common and mutual; each contributing to the advancement of the rest according to the measure of his gifts (1 Cor. xii.).

Priesthood and prophetism are two refractions as it were of the light proceeding from the same Holy Spirit, according to the twofold nature of the individual man, viz., *heart* and *spirit*, *action* and *knowledge*. Prophetism is the divine life as *inclination*, *feeling*, *action*. On the other hand, priesthood is the same divine life as *consciousness*, *doctrine*. In this lies the decision of the dispute as to whether religion is a thing of *faith* and *feeling*; or of *knowledge*. It is a thing of faith; all *scientific knowledge* being wholly foreign to its nature.

The spiritual priest- and prophet-hood of Christians was often adduced and recommended, in the first centuries of the church, by the better among the fathers, such as Tertullian, Augustine, etc. Their priestly and prophetic vocation is given only as an idea towards which there should be a constant approximation. As long as it is an earthly one, it can never be fully realised in action. Hence even the Christian church could not maintain itself long on this high platform on account of its hard-heartedness. The degeneracy happened first to the prophetic department, that is, the part of the Christian vocation referring to *the word of God*; and appeared in the inequality and one-sidedness of the gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. xii.-xiv.), as also in the necessity of spiritual guidance on the part of the mass. In consequence of such degeneracy, a peculiar spiritual office for teaching and the care of souls was instituted; which though limited at first to the place of common edification, soon absorbed all the activity of individuals. And not only was this prophetic part of the Christian calling suppressed, but the priestly privileges were overpowered by a peculiar Levitical priesthood, the *κλήρος* or clerical order. This sacerdotal caste thrust itself anew between God and man into the Levitical office as if it were a reconciling and mediating one, converting the general privilege of free access to God by Christ, into the monopoly of an order. The foundations of this need of a peculiar priesthood had been laid in the Old Testament by the ceremonial service in which the law consists. And as a similar ceremonial service arose in the Christian church also, a priesthood was felt to be necessary. Every extended legislation is followed by a number of transgressions, and therefore a great part of worship consisted in atoning for Levitical sins. As if to

meet such inclination of the priests, the mass had a strong tendency to put holiness in a particular place, to attach it to particular persons, and transfer it to a peculiar order. In this way it was the fate of Christianity to return to Judaism. The middle ages were not wanting in *Protestants* who opposed this usurpation. But *the protest* was not carried out till the Reformation. Part of this protest was, that human elements had been put into the place of the divine word; and that an outward righteousness of works had been established. It was a protest against the usurpation of universal priest- and prophet-hood by an especial caste. Yet the Reformation itself had respect to human weakness and hard-heartedness in not going so far as the spiritualist sects, that of the Anabaptists for example, who rejected all human rule, and even the administration of the means of grace. They also abolished the office of teaching. In the Reformation, however, a particular office for instructing and watching over souls in the administration of the word and sacraments was allowed to remain. But although it is difficult to draw the boundaries, and no strict principle can be carried out, the essential distinction between the Protestant and Catholic churches appears in the fact that the Protestant office of teaching does not assume a divine authority for carrying on a mediatorship between God and man; and therefore cannot take away the priestly rights of individuals. On the contrary it has for its scope the education of the individual's priesthood. The title to teach attached to a particular office in Protestantism is solely *disciplinary* and educational, whose object is to make itself superfluous. Yet even here it is matter of regret that the sacerdotal function of the individual has been overpowered by the attraction of the ministerial office; or in other words, by *theology*. Spener reasserted the right, and excited great commotion in consequence. Dr. Arnold did the same in opposition to the Tractarians.

END OF VOL. II.

